

★ No. 9335. 40345

1-20



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUPT. OF DOCUMENTS

9325-100
S. Res. 189

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES
AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRE-
TARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN
G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR
JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND
FRANCIS P. CARR

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
PURSUANT TO

S. Res. 189

PART 5

APRIL 26, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 15 1954

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	ALTON A. LENNON, North Carolina

RICHARD J. O'MELIA, *General Counsel*

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

RAY H. JENKINS, *Chief Counsel*

THOMAS R. PREWITT, *Assistant Counsel*

ROBERT A. COLLIER, *Assistant Counsel*

SOLIS HORWITZ, *Assistant Counsel*

CHARLES A. MANER, *Secretary*

CONTENTS

	Page
Testimony of Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary, Department of the Army—	178

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES AND
COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE
HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN,
AND FRANCIS P. CARR

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, Senator Karl E. Mundt, chairman, presiding.

Present: Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Senator Charles E. Potter, Republican, Michigan; Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Idaho; Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Also present: Ray H. Jenkins, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel; Ruth Y. Watt, chief clerk.

Principal participants: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin; Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Francis P. Carr, executive director of the subcommittee; Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army; John G. Adams, counselor to the Army; H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Joseph N. Welch, special counsel for the Army; James D. St. Clair, special counsel for the Army; and Frederick P. Bryan, counsel to H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. The committee will please come to order.

The Chair wishes to express its appreciation to Mr. Carroway for having installed a new loudspeaker system which I understand is operating much more effectively from the standpoint of our visitors in the room and the members of the press than the previous one.

I have been asked to state that Senator Dirksen is attending an important conference which will not detain him perhaps more than 15 or 20 minutes at the outside. But he wanted me to explain the reason why has was not here at the beginning, but he will be here shortly thereafter.

The committee will now come to order, and Mr. Stevens is here and he is seated at the witness table.

Here is Senator Dirksen in response to my promise. And our counsel, Mr. Jenkins, will proceed with the interrogatories.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS, SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY—Resumed

Mr. JENKINS. Shall we proceed now, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. You may proceed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, on last Friday, you had detailed the events of November 7; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Had you or had you not fully covered the events of that day when you were dismissed from the witness stand?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; I fully covered them, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you now to tell this committee when your next contact was with any member of the investigating staff at which time anything was discussed with reference to the issues in this case, and particularly whether or not any efforts were made on the part of any member of the staff to secure preferential treatment for G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, the next direct connection with any member of the staff came on the 16th of November.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you tell the members of the committee what occurred on that date and where those occurrences took place?

Secretary STEVENS. May I go back just a bit in doing that, sir?

Mr. JENKINS. You certainly may.

Secretary STEVENS. Because the events of the 16th of November are related to those of the 13th of November. That was a news conference that I held in my office in the Pentagon. The newspapers were very much interested in the progress of the Fort Monmouth investigation and in other items of Army business. The important thing, however, so far as this hearing is concerned, was the statement that I made in answer to a question to the effect that as of that date, November 13, I knew of no current espionage or spying at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not you have an exact copy of the statement you made to the press on November 13, or are you speaking from memory?

Secretary STEVENS. I am speaking from memory, but I think there possibly may be one available. I do not have it here, Mr. Jenkins.

I beg your pardon. We do have it here.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you please read that into the record?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, this is a very long—

Mr. JENKINS. Only that part of it relating to your statement with respect to whether or not there was any current espionage at Fort Monmouth.

Secretary STEVENS. I will be glad to do that, sir, but I will have to go through it and find out where it was. I am giving you the recollection on what the really important point was in the press conference.

Mr. JENKINS. While your attorney is finding that portion of the statement that is relevant, will you pass on to November 16, and then we will go back to the statement given the press.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, on November 16, Mr. Cohn came to my office with Mr. Carr, and they indicated that Senator McCarthy was very much displeased with my press conference.

Mr. JENKINS. What, precisely, did they say, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Cohn said that Senator McCarthy was mad, that I had double-crossed him, and words to that effect.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, I think Senator McCarthy is trying to get the attention of the Chair.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Jenkins, I just came in and I missed whether or not you developed who instigated this meeting, whether Mr. Cohn did or Mr. Carr or Mr. Stevens?

Mr. JENKINS. As of November 16, Senator?

Senator MCCARTHY. The one that we are talking about now.

Mr. JENKINS. Would you answer the question asked by the Senator from Wisconsin as to who initiated this meeting of November 16?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Cohn initiated it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Cohn did. Now go ahead and tell the events of that meeting as you recall them.

Secretary STEVENS. As I say, Mr. Cohn indicated that Senator McCarthy was very mad and felt that I had double-crossed him, and that he did not believe my statement to the press was a correct one. Of course, in the meanwhile the press had carried what I had said to a considerable extent; the impact of which was that I as of that date, November 13, did not know of any current espionage or spying at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask you while you are that subject, did you state in your release to the press that there was no current espionage at Fort Monmouth, or did you state there was none that you knew of?

Senator MUNDT. Before you answer, Mr. Secretary, the members of the committee are in difficulty because there is a new light added up there which shines in our eyes. From the left side of the chairman it is difficult even to see the witness. I think that light has either been moved closer to the table, or it has been made brighter, or something. It is very disturbing. That was not the case last week. Whoever is in charge of the light, please take the necessary corrective steps.

We will proceed.

I am sorry to interrupt and if you do not have the question, we will ask the reporter to repeat it.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I could say, sir, I didn't make any statement, I gave out no press release as I recall it, and it was a question and answer period with the press.

I think the important thing here is what I am quoting now from this draft, I said:

So far as the Army is concerned, it did not have any proof that there was any espionage.

Mr. JENKINS. Those were your exact words?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS (reading):

So far as the Army is concerned, it has no proof of espionage.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. That was on the 13th?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, you were discussing a conference between you and Mr. Cohn and Mr. Carr on November 16. Had you fully related

what had been said to you on that date by either Mr. Cohn or Mr. Carr?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I stated the main points to Mr. Jenkins, that before and after Senator McCarthy came into the room, I said that I was sorry that Senator McCarthy felt as Mr. Cohn indicated that he did, but I certainly hadn't intended to have any such effect, and I inquired where he was and found he was in New York, and I said I would go to New York and see Senator McCarthy, which I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Why did you go——

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Jenkins——

Senator MUNDT. The Senator will address the Chair rather than Mr. Jenkins, if he has a point of order. Is the Senator addressing the Chair?

Senator McCARTHY. With the young man here taking pictures, did I understand the Secretary to say that McCarthy was in the room at that time?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You said Mr. Cohn and Mr. Carr were in the room.

Secretary STEVENS. Correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Who did the talking, Mr. Cohn or Mr. Carr?

Secretary STEVENS. Mostly Mr. Cohn.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember anything whatever that was said to you on that occasion by Mr. Carr?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say that my recollection is principally the points made by Mr. Cohn, and I can't recall what Mr. Carr said.

Mr. JENKINS. You made no memorandum of that conversation at the time?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you are speaking from recollection?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, as a result of what was said to you on that occasion, that is November 16, you say that you went to New York to see Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. What was the purpose of that visit?

Secretary STEVENS. The purpose of the visit was that I felt that Senator McCarthy had misunderstood what I had said at the press conference. I felt what I had said at the press conference was correct, and I thought I would like to face right up to it, discuss the matter out and see where we stood.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, make peace? Is that what you mean, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I wanted to——

Mr. JENKINS. Very well, what was the date of that visit to New York?

Secretary STEVENS. The 17th of November.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you tell what transpired on the 17th of November between you and Senator McCarthy in New York City?

Secretary STEVENS. I flew to New York in the morning, and I took——

Mr. JENKINS. Did anyone go with you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, Colonel Cleary, of my staff, went with me, and Mr. Adams. I invited Senator McCarthy and his staff to have

luncheon with me once again at the Merchants Club in New York, which I have mentioned previously. That luncheon I should say was around 1 o'clock. Senator McCarthy came with Mr. Cohn and Mr. Carr, and he also brought with him Mr. Sokolsky, who joined with us throughout the period of the luncheon. I, of course, was there, and Colonel Cleary was there, and Mr. Adams was there.

After a few preliminaries, I said to Senator McCarthy or inquired of him as to why he was so provoked with me, and he indicated that he thought that my press conference had been badly handled, shall we say; that I hadn't given a correct picture as to the situation at Fort Monmouth, and he was quite put out about it.

So we then discussed the question of what should be done about it. I indicated that I would be willing to consider issuing a clarifying statement if there was one that appropriately could be issued. That was discussed. I recall that Mr. Sokolsky, who sat at the far end of the table from where I was, took a piece of paper and pencil and began to write some notes down, I think trying to formulate some possible area of agreement, if you will.

Mr. JENKINS. For the purpose of clarification, was that or not Mr. George Sokolsky, a newspaper columnist?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Go ahead now.

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Cohn also, I believe, made a few notes on a piece of paper looking toward a possible statement, and so did Mr. John Adams.

We had luncheon. As I recall it, that was the day when Attorney General Brownell was making his TV broadcast with respect to the White case. After luncheon we moved into the next room where I had asked television to be installed. We watched that for a while, and finally there was, I think, general agreement on a program for Senator McCarthy and myself to hold a joint news conference.

By this time I should add that the newspaper people had come to the Merchants Club in rather substantial numbers. Senator McCarthy and I went out and visited with them, I should think along about midafternoon.

The substance of my statement was that in saying that I had no evidence of current espionage or spying at Fort Monmouth, I was speaking for the Army, but I, of course, was not speaking for this committee. I made that distinction clear, which didn't change in any way the substance of my statement at the press conference, to wit, that I knew of no current espionage at Fort Monmouth. That is the statement that I made.

The Senator and I visited with the press for a few minutes, and then that adjourned.

Shall I carry on, sir?

Mr. JENKINS. Do you have any record of the exact statement you made to the press in New York City on this date, that is, November 17?

Secretary STEVENS. Of course, it was an extemporaneous statement. I am sure it is available in the press coverage of the event, but I don't think I have anything on it here, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it your position that it was in nowise different in substance to your first statement given to the press at the Pentagon?

Secretary STEVENS. No difference in substance. That is the way I felt about it.

Mr. JENKINS. But worded differently?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Designed for the purpose of, shall we say, pacifying or modifying the Senator?

Secretary STEVENS. I have been cooperating right along with the Senator and his committee, and I wanted to continue to do it.

Mr. JENKINS. Did Senator McCarthy invite you to come to New York City for the purpose of that conference and for the purpose of making any changes, if changes were made, in your release to the press?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. I initiated it.

Mr. JENKINS. You initiated that?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You asked whether or not you should continue, and my answer is yes, if you will, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. Then, with the meeting about to adjourn, it appeared that Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn and I think Mr. Carr were planning to hold hearings in Boston or in the Boston area the next day, and Mr. Cohn indicated that he wanted to see Private Schine before going to Boston.

Senator McCarthy indicated that he also would like to see Private Schine. So I said, "All right, I am going back to Washington. I will fly you down as far as McGuire Air Base, which adjoins Fort Dix."

So my party, along with Senator McCarthy's party, made that flight. We landed at McGuire Airbase, and we were met there by General Ryan, the commanding general of Fort Dix, by several members of his staff, and Private Schine was also there.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, did you ever see Mr. Roy Cohn personally subsequent to November 17 last year with reference to any issue in this controversy and particularly with reference to any effort on his part to secure preferences for Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. After the 17th of November?

Mr. JENKINS. Right.

Secretary STEVENS. I think not, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did he ever talk to you on the telephone with reference to Private Schine, subsequent to November 17, either in a call initiated by himself or by you?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not recall any call at the moment.

Mr. JENKINS. Did Senator McCarthy ever discuss Private Schine with you subsequent to November 17?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. When was the next time, Mr. Stevens?

Secretary STEVENS. The next time was on the 10th of December.

Mr. JENKINS. Where did that occur?

Secretary STEVENS. That occurred at luncheon at the Carroll Arms Hotel here in Washington.

Mr. JENKINS. What was said on that occasion by Senator McCarthy to you or to anyone in your presence with reference to Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy asked a number of times during the course of that luncheon if Private Schine could be assigned to New York.

Mr. JENKINS. Who was present at that luncheon, may I ask, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, Mr. Carr, Mr. Adams, and myself.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy asked on several occasions why he couldn't be assigned to New York at the end of 8 weeks of basic training.

Mr. JENKINS. How many times would you say, in your best judgment, such a question was asked you or such a request was made by Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say about three, just as a guess.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not on that occasion I understood that the Senator was quite insistent about the matter or——

Secretary STEVENS. Yes——

Mr. JENKINS. Or were those statements made in a casual sort of way?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes; I felt that through repetition he was quite insistent about it. He also said that he knew of a number of cases where boys had been given assignments after 8 weeks of basic training.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know of any case where a boy had been given such an assignment after only 8 weeks of basic training?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I didn't.

Mr. JENKINS. What were your replies to the Senator?

Secretary STEVENS. I told him that David Schine, like every other boy, would have to finish his 16 weeks of basic training.

Mr. JENKINS. And what were the reactions of the Senator to that?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I am sure that, of course I am sure that the Senator knew that I meant it when I said that.

Mr. JENKINS. Did anything else of interest occur at the Carroll Arms on November 10?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that was the principal event.

Mr. JENKINS. When next, if at all, did Senator McCarthy contact you or did you converse with him——

Senator McCARTHY. I hate to interrupt, Mr. Chairman. But I wonder if Mr. Jenkins would again make it clear who initiated this meeting.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask this question now: You were talking about this conference at the Carroll Arms on December 10.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Was that meeting initiated by Senator McCarthy or any member of his staff or——

Secretary STEVENS. By them.

Mr. JENKINS. By them?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. Also, I recall one other item that the Senator was talking about; an assignment for Private Schine in New York.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you stop there?

Senator MUNDT. The Senator has a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I just wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary would identify who he means by "them." I understood Mr. Adams

initiated this. And I wish he would tell who initiated this meeting.

Secretary STEVENS. My recollection is, Senator, it was originated by your office.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well; you may go ahead.

Now, you say there was one other item of interest that occurred on the day of December 10 that you had not related to the committee. Will you do so now?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, in connection with a possible assignment of Private Schine to New York, Senator McCarthy suggested that he might be useful in checking West Point textbooks.

Mr. JENKINS. And what was your reply to that?

Secretary STEVENS. That Private Schine would have to finish his 16 weeks' basic training.

Mr. JENKINS. When next, if at all, did either the Senator or any member of his staff contact you or you contact them with reference to David Schine, if at all?

Secretary STEVENS. I think the next contact was the 14th of January.

Mr. JENKINS. What occurred then, Mr. Stevens, and where did it occur?

Secretary STEVENS. On that one I initiated that meeting——

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. I was——

Mr. JENKINS. That is January 14, as we understand it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes. I was planning to leave for the Far East on the 17th, and I had an extensive trip to the Eighth Army, and other points in the Far East, coming up. I wanted to have a meeting with Senator McCarthy before I left so that I could tell him I was going. And he knew I would be out of circulation, so to speak for a while, so I asked for this meeting; and it was arranged to meet at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, or thereabouts, at the Carroll Arms Hotel.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that there was an item of contact in written form that the witness has passed by inadvertently. I call your attention, Mr. Stevens, to a letter that I now show you.

Senator MUNDT. He may revert to that and show it in the record.

Secretary STEVENS. I had not forgotten it, but I can answer your question which related to personal contact. The fact remains——

Mr. JENKINS. Do you have a letter in your possession from any party in interest to this controversy?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. From whom?

Secretary STEVENS. From Senator McCarthy.

Mr. JENKINS. What is the date of that letter?

Secretary STEVENS. The letter is dated December 22, and it is one which has been previously referred to in this hearing.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, will you now read that letter into the record for the benefit of this committee and then file it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. [Reading:]

HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS,

Secretary of the Army,

The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I have heard rumors to the effect that some of the members of my staff have intervened with your Department in behalf of a former staff consultant, David Schine. This they, of course, have a right to do as individuals.

However, as I have told you a number of times, I have an unbreakable rule that neither I nor anyone in my behalf shall ever attempt to interfere with or influence the Army in its assignments, promotions, et cetera.

I have discussed this matter with members of my staff, some of whom feel very strongly that in view of the fact that Mr. Schine is over 26 years of age, attempted to enlist in the Army when he was 18, was refused because of a slipped disc in his back, and thereupon enlisted in the merchant marine, he would never have been drafted except that the extreme left-wing writers such as Pearson, et al., started screaming about his case, because he was a consultant for our committee. I realize that the decision of the draft board to reopen his case obviously was unknown to you and far below your level of operations.

While I am inclined to agree that Mr. Schine would never have been drafted, except because of the fact he worked for my committee, I want to make it clear at this time that no one has any authority to request any consideration for Mr. Schine other than what other draftees get. I think it is extremely important that this be made very clear in view of the present investigation which our committee is conducting of the Communist infiltration of the military under the Truman-Acheson regime.

Let me repeat what I have said to you before, the course of this investigation will in absolutely no way be influenced by the Army's handling of the case of any individual, regardless of whether he worked for my committee or not.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you file that, Mr. Secretary, as an exhibit to your testimony?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I will.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, you had passed to the events of January 14, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you tell the committee what occurred then?

Secretary STEVENS. I met Senator McCarthy at the Carroll Arms about 6 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. JENKINS. Was that by appointment?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir, initiated by me.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, who was present on the occasion of that meeting, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy and I were present alone for the first part of the meeting, and we were later joined by a gentleman who Senator McCarthy introduced to me as Al McCarthy.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know him?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I did not.

Mr. JENKINS. Have you later learned that he is not related to Senator McCarthy, for the purpose of identifying him?

Secretary STEVENS. The Senator told me at the time.

Mr. JENKINS. Now tell what occurred at the Carroll Arms at 5 o'clock p. m. on January 14 of this year.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I explained my forthcoming trip to the Far East to the Senator, and I also told him about the fact that David Schine was going to be transferred at the end of 8 weeks of basic training to Camp Gordon, which is the provost marshal general's center at Camp Gordon, Ga. I told him that that was where the criminal investigation school of the provost marshal general's department was located, and I indicated that if David Schine applied and if he qualified, it was possible that he might finally be accepted in the school; but that would depend first of all on David Schine himself and his record, and secondly, whether or not he qualified.

During the course of this meeting, on 4 or 5 occasions Senator McCarthy brought up the question of whether or not David Schine could

be assigned to New York City when his training was over. I said that David Schine would have to finish his training.

Mr. JENKINS. Did the Senator tell you why he would like to have Schine assigned to the New York City area?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, he did not tell me why, but he persistently asked me.

Mr. JENKINS. You said 4 or 5 times, Mr. Stevens?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did anything of interest occur on that occasion?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I think possibly one item, and that was that I was somewhat sensitive to this being asked—this question about David Schine being assigned to New York City after his training—so when it came up it made an impression on me and finally I said to Senator McCarthy, "Now, you wrote me a letter dated December 22"—the one that I have just read into the record, Mr. Jenkins—"in which you said that there was not to be any pressure or anything of that kind put on the Army, and I would just like to remind you of that letter." The Senator dropped that particular point.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not you and Senator McCarthy ever subsequently to that time discussed David Schine.

Secretary STEVENS. I left on the 17th for the Far East and I did not get back until the 23d of February, and I don't think we did.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe you stated that subsequent to November 17 you never had any conversation with Mr. Roy Cohn with reference to Schine, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall any, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. So your last conversation with the Senator was on January 14, this year.

Secretary STEVENS. With respect to Schine, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did Mr. Frank Carr ever contact you or discuss with you Schine subsequent to the 17th of November?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall that he did, no, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, you state in your pleadings, as I recall, that no less than 65 telephone calls were made to you or to your subordinates with reference to favors or preferential treatment to David Schine. Is that correct or not?

Secretary STEVENS. Telephone calls on the subject of David Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. From the McCarthy investigating committee, you mean, or members of its staff?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. There were, I think, all told about that number.

Mr. JENKINS. 65?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. As I recall you state that there were some 19 personal contacts with you or members of your staff with reference to David Schine, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Making a total of 84 contacts either in person or by telephone with reference to either a commission or preferential treatment for Schine; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I would say, Mr. Jenkins, with reference to Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. With reference to Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. By that do you mean that not all of them were in the form of requests for leaves of absence, escaping KP, and things of that kind?

Secretary STEVENS. I think a large number of them were—I know a large number of them were for that purpose, but I would not want to say that every one of those 84 contacts in which the subject of Schine was discussed was for specific preferential treatment. Most of them I think were.

Mr. JENKINS. On the occasion of the last conversation you had with the Senator on the 14th of January you had then been in office approximately 1 year, lacking perhaps a couple of weeks; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. About 3 weeks; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. During that year's period state whether or not you received calls or were contacted personally with reference to any other soldier, inductee, or draftee, in any comparable number of times?

Secretary STEVENS. Positively not.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, I want to ask you this question: Did you feel that these efforts and attempts on the part of this staff on behalf of Schine were made by Senator McCarthy personally, individually, or as a United States Senator on the one hand; or that they were made by him not only as a Senator but also as a member of the so-called McCarthy investigating committee, with all of its judicial powers, we will say? What were your impressions with respect to that?

Secretary STEVENS. My impression was, Mr. Jenkins, that Mr. Cohn—

Mr. JENKINS. My question was with reference to Senator McCarthy, to begin with.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. I was going to relate that, if I may. I was going to say my impression was that Mr. Cohn was tremendously interested in Mr. Schine and in having special treatment for Mr. Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you mean Mr. Cohn as Mr. Roy Cohn individually, or Mr. Cohn occupying the powerful position that he did as chief counsel for this investigating committee?

Secretary STEVENS. I mean occupying the powerful position that he did of chief counsel for this committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you feel that he used his office in an attempt at a perversion of the rules of the Army with reference to the treatment accorded an inductee or draftee?

Secretary STEVENS. I do.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Your point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. I think it might be well, in view of this line of questions that Mr. Cohn "exerted," that Mr. Stevens be asked to produce the Inspector General's report on just what consideration Mr. Schine got. I am curious to know what special consideration he got. I think it should be in the record. I am suggesting that you do this out of order. Mr. Jenkins may have in mind doing this later. I don't know.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, may I state I am about ready to cross-examine the witness, and I do ask the Senator to be patient. I think those matters will be clarified.

Senator McCARTHY. Certainly.

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair remind all the members of the committee and the counsel for both sides that under the rules by which we operate, the counsel is to proceed without interruption save only for a point of order, and it is a little bit disruptive of counsel's line of thinking if members of the committee or members of the counsel endeavor to anticipate the questions he is about to ask.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like, if I may, for the record, to get some information from the Chair. We do not have nearly as many admirals here as generals—

Senator MUNDT. That would not be a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. There is a question I would like to ask you. I would like to know whether any of these generals are here at the request of the subcommittee, or whether they are here at the request of someone from the Pentagon.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will say that the only person here this morning at the request of the subcommittee is Secretary Stevens, who is seated behind the microphone.

Senator McCARTHY. Thank you very much.

Senator MUNDT. You may proceed.

Mr. JENKINS. You have related your impressions and opinions with reference to efforts or pressure on the part of Mr. Cohn.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Getting back to my previous question with reference to Senator McCarthy, do you recall what the question is?

Secretary STEVENS. If it is not asking too much, I would appreciate having it repeated, Mr. Jenkins.

Senator MUNDT. Is counsel able to repeat it?

Mr. JENKINS. I don't mind repeating it.

Senator MUNDT. You may repeat it.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you consider that these requests, these conversations, these statements you have related on the part of Senator McCarthy with respect to Schine, were made by him as a person, an individual, or a United States Senator on the one hand; or, on the other hand, not only as a United States Senator but as chairman of the powerful investigating committee which he headed, with all of its judicial powers? In what capacity did you consider he was acting, Mr. Stevens, in these various requests made of you by him?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, at first I thought that it was, you might say, a sort of personal thing in some way. That was the way it began. But as it went along over a period of time and continued to recur, and the chief counsel, Mr. Cohn, showed the vigorous interest that he did in the subject, I finally had no other course than to conclude that Mr. Cohn's activities were with the knowledge and approval of the chairman of this committee.

Mr. JENKINS. I take it that you knew that these various requests and pressures you have detailed were occurring simultaneously with the investigation of this committee of a department of the Army, to wit, Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, I will ask you whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Frank Carr, a party in interest, considering his participation in this general pattern you have detailed, sought to and did use his office in an effort to secure favors for David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say, Mr. Jenkins, that Mr. Carr's activities in this connection were extremely limited by comparison with Mr. Cohn's. I don't think that he had nearly the interest in the subject. He was present at times when it came up. I don't think he did anything to keep it from coming up.

By the same token, in my particular firsthand contact with it, Mr. Carr did not have anything like the pressure approach to it that Mr. Cohn did.

Mr. JENKINS. You would say, generally, his attitude was a passive one?

Secretary STEVENS. Very largely.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, I want to ask you this final question on direct examination and you may consult your counsel if you desire before you answer it.

Is there any other fact or are there any other facts or circumstances in support of the charges you have made against the investigating committee about which I have not asked you on direct examination that you now want to relate to this committee?

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Secretary STEVENS. I think, Mr. Jenkins, that Mr. Adams has a great deal of information that will be presented and which is related to many of the areas or points which I directly came in contact with this thing.

Mr. JENKINS. I am talking about the matters peculiarly within your own personal knowledge.

Secretary STEVENS. I think I have substantially covered that, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. This is in the form of a statement.

Senator MUNDT. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. JENKINS. You appreciate the fact that my position, Mr. Stevens, is a peculiar one, representing the committee, representing neither the Army, nor the Senator or members of his staff. And that in a proper appraisal of the value of your testimony, a proper evaluation of it, a cross-examination is proper so that the committee's attention may be called to any matters that are proper to bring out on cross-examination. You appreciate that fact, do you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You further know the charges have been preferred against you and Mr. Adams by Senator McCarthy and the members of his staff?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You know what those charges are and you have read his document?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, your charges in the main against the Senator, indeed, as I recall, the only charge you made was that he, Mr. Cohn, and Mr. Carr sought to use undue and improper influences to secure preferential treatment for one G. David Schine, that is correct, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, I ask you this: In making a proper appraisal in what efforts, if any, were made by the Senator, and the members of his staff, is it not proper in your opinion to give consideration to the work in which David Schine was engaged with this committee and to the work in which the committee was engaged? Is that right, in your opinion?

Secretary STEVENS. I think they were entitled to give that consideration.

Mr. JENKINS. In short, a dozen calls by Senator McCarthy or any member of his staff with reference, we will say, to me, who is not essential, might be considered unusual and extraordinary, and you might consider that unfair pressure was being brought to bear upon you, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. I am afraid, sir, that I didn't quite follow that question.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, hypothetically, assume that Senator McCarthy and the members of his staff put in, we will say, a dozen calls for a man who was engaged in nonessential work, a ditchdigger, and I mean no reflection on a ditchdigger. Might that not be considered an extraordinary number of times for intercession on behalf of that particular individual?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Assume, on the other hand, that that number of calls and that number of contacts were made by and on behalf of a man who had special training in the investigation of espionage and of infiltration of Communists in the Army and other departments of the Government, whose work of vital importance to the national defense and security. Under those circumstances, Mr. Stevens, is it not your opinion that the same number of calls put in for the latter-described man would not be considered extraordinary?

Secretary STEVENS. I think it would be considered extraordinary. And, if I may, sir, I would like to go back to your first question on this subject, because I am not sure but what I misunderstood it. It seems to me—

Mr. JENKINS. Well, the question is this: What would be extraordinary for one man would not be extraordinary for another, depending on the character of work the man is in, am I right or not?

Secretary STEVENS. There could be a difference, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That is what I am getting at.

Now, Mr. Stevens—

Secretary STEVENS. Could I go back, because on your first question, dealing with this situation, you asked me a question about whether or not it was proper to take David Schine's qualifications into account or something of that sort.

I think that the place and time to do that, Mr. Jenkins, was prior to his being drafted and not after he was drafted by selective service which is a completely independent arm of the Government. I think once the selective-service process worked that it was then incumbent upon Senator McCarthy and his staff not to make calls, such as you referred to, to the Army.

Mr. JENKINS. Then it is your opinion that after the processes of the draft have been fully completed, and executed, and the subject is drafted and in the Army, that regardless of his qualifications or the character of work in which he is engaged, be it the investigation

of espionage or otherwise, that any effort on the part of anyone on his behalf is improper?

Secretary STEVENS. I won't say any effort. I think it is perfectly all right, and it would all come out anyway through the testing that we do with all of the boys that come into the Army as to what his qualifications were. And if Senator McCarthy wanted to call it to your attention, I would have no objection to it. But I do object violently to the amount of attention that was devoted in this particular case.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, is it not a fact that you did make concessions to David Schine with reference to leaves of absences, passes, and so on?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, we did, and the reason we did it is because, as I said on Friday, we did not want, or I did not want, the Army to be in the position of obstructing the work of a committee of Congress that at that time was engaged in investigating the Army. Therefore, since this consultant to this committee's staff had been taken by selective service, and had been inducted in the Army, or was about to be, my position was that in the tapering off process from the time he left his assignment as consultant to this committee until he became 100 percent Army private, that it was reasonable during that change-over or transition period that he should be made available for committee business, for committee business alone, if it did not interfere with his training.

Mr. JENKINS. And you did do that?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And he was given an extraordinarily large number of passes and leaves of absences, wasn't he?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And Mr. Stevens, that was because he was a consultant on a committee attempting to and/or tracking down infiltration of communism in the Army, wasn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, starting with that as a major premise, I ask you now to give the Stevens versions, if I may refer to it thusly, of the investigation by Senator McCarthy and his staff of Fort Monmouth. I want your version of the work that was done by the Senator and his staff, the character of work they did, the importance of it in your opinion, and the necessity for it, or the lack of necessity for it as relating to Fort Monmouth.

Secretary STEVENS. All right, sir. The formal hearings which were in executive session of this committee in the case of Fort Monmouth, started on October 8, 1953.

I assumed there had been work done by the staff of this committee prior to the opening of those hearings. The Army, itself, had, of course, been carrying on investigatory work at Fort Monmouth as well as elsewhere throughout the Army system, and continuously so.

We were aware of the history at Fort Monmouth. We wanted to be sure that our security situation was in good shape and certainly that there was no espionage. We collaborated very closely with the FBI in respect of Fort Monmouth. We took up under the new criteria

of the new administration matters of security, looking into cases where there could be any possible question.

I think prior—in fact, I know that prior to the formal opening of the Fort Monmouth hearing, there had been six suspensions in Fort Monmouth for security reasons—in other words, cases where individuals—where there was no question of loyalty involved but for one reason or another, either because of derogatory information or because the person might talk too much, or something of that kind, those cases—it was that type of case that were the six that were suspended prior to October 8.

Mr. JENKINS. They would be poor security risks at Fort Monmouth, is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. They might be.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand. You are saying now that they were suspended as a result of the efforts of your agency and not that of the McCarthy committee, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Six of them?

Secretary STEVENS. Six of them.

Mr. JENKINS. Prior to the opening of the formal hearings by Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. Following the opening of the hearings and up to this time there had been an additional 29 suspensions.

Mr. JENKINS. As a result of the McCarthy investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; as a result; I would like to answer this way, if I may, because I think you have given me an extraordinarily difficult question and I would like to answer it to the best of my ability.

Mr. JENKINS. You are entitled to explain. I think maybe we are entitled to a yes or no answer, and then you are certainly entitled to explain. But if you can't answer it yes or no, answer it the best way you can. You know my question.

You say that you procured the suspension of six men, civilian employees at Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. I think it is in this record abundantly that Fort Monmouth is the site of a radar installation, is it not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; for research and development of it.

Mr. JENKINS. Research and development and it is tremendously important to the security of the Nation?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Primarily where defenses against the atomic and the hydrogen bombs are set up; is that right, Mr. Stevens?

Secretary STEVENS. I would—

Mr. JENKINS. It is one of the sites?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. I prefer not to elaborate on that, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

You had procured the suspension of six men; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Prior to the entrance of Senator McCarthy into the picture?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. We are asking you now for your version, and, of course, with the understanding that when the time comes we will get the McCarthy version.

Secretary STEVENS. Correct; that is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Have any of those six men suspended as a result of your efforts been reinstated?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, you asked me to give my story about Fort Monmouth, and I want to go through that to the best of my ability. On the other hand, if you want to go into the detail of every single one of those cases—

Mr. JENKINS. No, sir. I have no intention of doing that whatever. It is just the simple question: Were any of them ever reinstated? I am referring to the six men.

Secretary STEVENS. I can't answer that; but I can say this: That out of the total of 35 who were involved, the 6 originally suspended and 29 later, 13 of those have been reinstated in nonsensitive positions; that is to say, clerical or other type of jobs where classified material is not available to them. That is due to the fact that thus far no charges of sufficient substance have been put together to affect these 13 people.

So they have been reinstated in nonsensitive positions pending further investigation of their cases to see in a fair American way whether or not charges can be preferred.

Now, in respect to the other remaining 22 cases, 16 of those have been heard by hearing boards in the First Army area. Those hearing boards are in process of making reports on these cases. I don't have any reports on any of them as of this present time.

The six remaining cases of suspended employees at Fort Monmouth remain to be heard by a hearing board.

I would like to say that thus far, and we have indication that this will continue, there has been no case in which any one of these 35 people has pleaded the fifth amendment or refused to answer any questions that have been put to them.

Mr. JENKINS. Senator Stevens—pardon me. Mr. Secretary, I don't know whether that would be a promotion or not.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair didn't like that "pardon me."

Mr. JENKINS. I will apologize to the chairman.

Were there 27 suspensions as a result of the McCarthy investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. My answer to that, if I have to answer it yes or no, would have to be no. Then I have to say but.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, say but and explain why.

Secretary STEVENS. The reason I say but is that I think it is probably true that as a result of this committee's activities some of those suspensions took effect sooner than they otherwise would have.

Mr. JENKINS. How many would you say occurred sooner than—what you are saying to the committee now, I think, is that if Senator McCarthy had stayed out of the picture you would ultimately have accomplished the same result that he did; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. But don't you consider, Mr. Secretary, that time is of the essence in the detection of infiltration of Communists in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. I certainly do, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And that the expediting and the segregation and the pinpointing of one with communistic leanings is quite important?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You concede that the McCarthy committee brought about that result?

Secretary STEVENS. They speeded up the suspension, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Speeded it up? How many?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think I could answer that.

Mr. JENKINS. Twenty-odd?

Secretary STEVENS. I just don't know.

Mr. JENKINS. Twenty-odd?

Secretary STEVENS. I will try to give you an answer to that question, but I don't have an estimate of it now.

Mr. JENKINS. At least there are twenty-odd still under suspension, aren't there?

Secretary STEVENS. Twenty-two, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Twenty-two still under suspension?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, for the purpose of clarification, I want to ask you this question: What person or group of persons or board is responsible, is charged with the duty of making an order effectuating a suspension?

Secretary STEVENS. The action originates with the commanding officer of the particular installation.

Mr. JENKINS. That was General Zwicker?

Secretary STEVENS. General Lawton.

Mr. JENKINS. General Lawton at Fort Monmouth; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. It originates with him?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it consummated by him or is it reviewed by a board?

Secretary STEVENS. It is reviewed by the First Army Headquarters and then reviewed here in the Department of the Army by what is known as a screening board.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words the suspension is brought about by Army personnel exclusively?

Secretary STEVENS. Army personnel either in or out of uniform; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And neither Senator McCarthy, Cohn, nor Carr had one thing to do with determining whether or not a suspension should be made; they simply revealed the facts in an investigation, and then your personnel having those facts before them ruled that the facts were sufficient to justify a suspension; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct, but I would like to add to it that we had facts available, also.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know exactly what you mean by that statement.

Secretary STEVENS. I was not sure from the way you stated it, Mr. Jenkins, as to whether you meant that the McCarthy committee had supplied all of the information on which these suspensions took place.

Mr. JENKINS. Did the McCarthy committee supply any information that was before this board, the commanding general and the personnel of the Army, when these suspensions were put into effect?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say they supplied some information.

Mr. JENKINS. You would say they did?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you would say, and I believe you have said, that their efforts resulted in expediting the suspension of these men under question about whom there was some question?

Secretary STEVENS. To some extent; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That is correct; is it not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, you are not trying to minimize the efforts of the McCarthy committee; are you?

Secretary STEVENS. Am I trying to?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, that is what I am asking you.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I don't feel that I am trying to minimize the efforts of the committee; I am simply trying to get out here, as I know you want me to do, all of—

Mr. JENKINS. This committee wants you to do it, and so do I.

Secretary STEVENS. The facts I have in respect to Fort Monmouth. My own feeling is that it was a greatly overexaggerated situation.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, that reflects your feelings and opinions, does it not, of that very statement?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That it was a greatly overexaggerated situation?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, Mr. Stevens. I believe that you have already stated that you as Secretary of the Army were vitally interested in cleaning out subversives or those about whom there was any question at the earliest possible moment. That is right; is it not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you concede that Senator McCarthy and his staff did that very thing; do you not?

Secretary STEVENS. I concede that Senator McCarthy and his staff, through the investigation, speeded up to some extent the suspension of some people; but we had information about all of these people and the action would have been taken, but they speeded it up to a certain extent.

Mr. JENKINS. But the point is that it had not been taken, had it, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. It was in the process.

Mr. JENKINS. You had not?

Secretary STEVENS. It was in the process of being taken; yes, sir. You see, under the new security regulations in the Government, all of these types of cases were automatically under a new review.

Mr. JENKINS. Ultimately, you say you would have accomplished the same result?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. But Senator McCarthy accomplished it before you had the opportunity to do it; is that it?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I do not quite agree that that is it.

Mr. JENKINS. You do not agree to that. Now, I understood you did, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. I think that I stated—I do not want to in any way evade Mr. Jenkins in any questions. I want to call them exactly as I see them. As I see this case, through the efforts of the committee,

there was expedited to a certain extent some of the cases in which the suspensions took place.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, very good, I think that answers the question. You would say, therefore, that Senator McCarthy and his staff did an important piece of work that enhanced national security—time being of the essence in the detection of Communists or Reds or “pinks” or whatever you want to call them—in the Army or any other branch of the Government, is that not correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That question, Mr. Jenkins, I will have to ask the reporter to read because it is a rather long one and I am not sure I can grasp it.

Senator MUNDT. Will the reporter read the question.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I certainly agree it is correct to find the security risks, loyalty cases, and act on it fast. There is no question about that. We are all in accord on that completely. The only thing that I say in regard to this, Mr. Jenkins, is having said that in my opinion Senator McCarthy's investigation did speed up to a certain extent in a certain number of cases, I would go on and say that in respect of the whole overall situation which is referred to in your question, that I think it would have been far more effective if we had not pursued the publicity tactics that went with this investigation. I think that that did a lot of harm in a lot of ways.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you charge Senator McCarthy with the publicity that his investigations entailed?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, whenever Senator McCarthy holds an executive session—

Mr. JENKINS. The press is there, I am sure.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. The press is there, and they are not in the executive session, of course, but when the session is over, Senator McCarthy gives them a rundown of how he feels the thing transpired. And I feel that, right or wrong, a great deal of misinformation and excitement was caused by the reports that he developed after these executive sessions.

Mr. JENKINS. And, Mr. Stevens, you wanted it stopped, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And, consequently, you wanted Senator McCarthy's investigation stopped, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I didn't want it stopped.

Mr. JENKINS. You didn't want it stopped?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, one of the charges made against you is that you sought to discredit his committee and the importance of the work, and do you recall that?

Secretary STEVENS. I never did any such thing.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you, if you haven't here this morning, on the witness stand, damned him with faint praise, so to speak. Haven't you done that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I think that I have given him credit for having expedited to a certain extent some of those cases at Fort Monmouth.

Mr. JENKINS. Haven't you here on the witness stand this morning minimized the importance of his work in the investigation of Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. I have told you that the work would have gotten done anyhow.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand it, but you further told us that time was of the essence, and it is always too late to lock the barn when the horse is stolen, you know that. And, Mr. Stevens, there are now 20 men still under suspension, after a lapse of 6 months, suspended by you and your personnel, partially as a result of the work of the McCarthy committee; is that not correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask you at this point, who is responsible for the reinstatement of those men?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know that I can give that information under the Presidential directives.

Mr. JENKINS. If it violates a directive, or confidential information, I withdraw the question. Is that your answer?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; until I have had a chance to look it up. And if it doesn't violate it, I would certainly like to put it in, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, you understood all along that one of the consultants of this very committee whose work we have been talking about was one G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You understood that, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you understand that he was somewhat of an authority on communism, and had written at least a pamphlet on that subject?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that I knew that he had written a pamphlet; yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you ever ask him to mail to you that pamphlet?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall having done so. I might have; I don't recall having done so, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. I hand you a letter, if we can find it. [Laughter.]

Senator MUNDT. The Army has had similar difficulties, I might add, about finding letters.

Mr. JENKINS. I withdraw the question. I am sorry.

I hand you a letter dated September 21, 1953, rather, a copy of a letter reading as follows:

HON. J. P. STEVENS,

Secretary of the Army,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEVENS: As I promised, I am sending to you a copy of the Definition of Communism which I hope you will find interesting. It was certainly a pleasure to see you the other morning, and I hope to see you again in the near future.

With very best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

G. DAVID SCHINE,

Chief Consultant, Senate Investigating Subcommittee.

Will you please examine that, Mr. St. Clair, and hand it to the Secretary.

Then tell the committee whether or not you received the original of that letter, together with a pamphlet entitled, "Definition of Communism," by G. David Schine, which I likewise now hand you for your inspection.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I think I recall this now, Mr. Jenkins. I am not J. P. Stevens, to whom this letter is addressed——

Mr. JENKINS. But you did receive that?

Secretary STEVENS. I assume that I must have received the letter, because I now recall having seen a copy of this pamphlet. I also recall that I attended a meeting of this committee in executive session on September 21, 1953, and no doubt Dave Schine must have spoken about this thing at that time.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know, therefore, that David Schine was a consultant member of Senator McCarthy's investigating committee?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You knew prior to his induction in the service, which was on November 3, as we understand it——

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. That he was actively engaged with Senator McCarthy and his staff in the investigation of Fort Monmouth? You knew that, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, the first knowledge that you had that the Army, of which you were the Secretary, was about to be investigated by Senator McCarthy, was when you were on the weekend of Labor Day in the State of Montana; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. It was, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You do not know, of course, when the Senator and his staff made their plans for the investigation of the First Army area, do you?

Secretary STEVENS. No, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. You read of the proposal of the Senator, to make this investigation, in a newspaper in a drugstore in a town in Montana?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; that was with reference to the three original cases in New York City.

Mr. JENKINS. In the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Their names were given?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You immediately went to the railroad station and sent the Senator a telegram, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Up to that time, you had never contacted him, had you?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You had never been to Fort Monmouth yourself?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. I went on October 20.

Mr. JENKINS. But I say up to that time——

Secretary STEVENS. Correct.

Mr. JENKINS. That is, the early part of September, you had never been to Fort Monmouth, had you?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I had not.

Mr. JENKINS. Up to that time you had never directed your investigating agency specifically to pinpoint Fort Monmouth and investigate it, had you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes; I had.

Mr. JENKINS. You had done so?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Was that a general order to investigate all of the Army posts, or particularly Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, as I told you, sir, we had extremely close contact with the FBI in regard to Fort Monmouth, and that was a little bit different from the usual run of directives that might go out.

Mr. JENKINS. Asking my question again, had you at that time specifically called in your investigating agency and said: "Go to Fort Monmouth and see what is going on up there?" Had you done that?

Secretary STEVENS. I hadn't personally called them in and told them to go to Fort Monmouth, that is right.

Mr. JENKINS. It was a general order to investigate everything and everybody connected with the Army, as we understand it, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; that is not correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well.

Secretary STEVENS. That is not correct, on account of the reference that I made, and I hope I don't have to belabor this point because I just don't like to; but as I say, we had very close relationship with the FBI in regard to this particular matter.

Mr. JENKINS. But you had no relationship at that time with Senator McCarthy and the McCarthy committee, did you?

Secretary STEVENS. No.

Mr. JENKINS. So did you cut your trip short to come back?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You contacted Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Upon coming back, is that right, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Immediately.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, the truth of the matter is that on that first meeting with Senator McCarthy you sought in every honorable way, I will say, possible to get him to desist and to let you carry on that work, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. In the first meeting with Senator McCarthy?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You did not?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You say you never did at any time?

Secretary STEVENS. Get him to cease and desist?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, sir.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, let me ask you this question. I know you are human. Irrespective of what efforts you made or didn't make, you would rather he had not undertaken this investigation of Fort Monmouth and have left it up to you, had you not?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I would not say that.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, would you deny it?

Secretary STEVENS. What do you mean, would I deny it?

Mr. JENKINS. You say you won't say it. I am asking you if you will deny it.

Secretary STEVENS. No, because I say——

Mr. JENKINS. You don't deny it?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I say——

MR. JENKINS. You know what the question is. You would rather he had not initiated the investigation and left it up to you.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. I am perfectly agreeable to working with Senator McCarthy's committee or any other committee of the Congress on any subject that affects the Department of the Army. I consider it not only a duty but a privilege to work with these committees.

I approached my whole relationship with the Congress on that basis.

May I make one minor correction, Mr. Jenkins, because I think that inadvertently—this has just come into my mind—that I made a slight mistake in response to one of your questions. That is when you asked me if I cut my trip short in Montana. I think you asked me that.

MR. JENKINS. Yes, I did.

Secretary STEVENS. I think I said yes as we were going along. I didn't. I had planned to leave there on Labor Day and fly back, and I did that. I think I indicated in my wire to Senator McCarthy that I was returning by the following morning. That is a minor thing, but I don't want to have it on the record incorrectly.

MR. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, on numerous occasions in your direct examination you have told of initiating visits with the Senator and his staff and of calls with the Senator and his staff; have you not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

MR. JENKINS. You have told of initiating visits to New York City; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

MR. JENKINS. I believe—when did you first hear that there was a person in this world named G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I believe that was on the 8th of September, Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JENKINS. Is that the time that you had coffee at the breakfast table in the Schine apartment; that is, the apartment of his father and mother?

Secretary STEVEN. No, sir; this was when I returned from the West and first visited Senator McCarthy on the 8th of September.

MR. JENKINS. When was it that you had breakfast or coffee in the Schine apartment in New York City?

Secretary STEVENS. That was the 16th of September.

MR. JENKINS. You knew then who David Schine was, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

MR. JENKINS. You knew that he was on the McCarthy committee and that he was subject to be drafted? That is right, is it not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

MR. JENKINS. And you knew that he was the son of a multimillionaire?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I would not say I knew that.

MR. JENKINS. The son of very wealthy parents?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I do not think that I had any knowledge of the financial position of the Schine family other than walking into the apartment that morning and seeing that it was a very nice place.

MR. JENKINS. You knew then that he was a controversial figure, did you not, Mr. Secretary, and had been talked about on the radio and written up in newspaper columns, particularly with reference to his draft status?

Secretary STEVENS. I know there had been considerable discussion about that.

Mr. JENKINS. And you went with Senator McCarthy, or at the invitation of the Senator, to the very home where this boy lived on September 16, did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you not feel like such a visit might compromise you or cause some criticism?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I did not. I felt——

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Excuse me. Go ahead, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. I was going to say that I was in New York at that time. The first contact with Senator McCarthy was on the 8th of September, and I was anxious to follow it up and do all I could to expedite whatever actions might be necessary. I thought while I was in New York I would like to see the Senator, and so I contacted him and he suggested that place of meeting. I would have met him anywhere; it did not make any difference to me.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, did you ever at any other time become a guest in the Schine home in New York City?

Secretary STEVENS. Not in the home, sir. I referred Friday to the dinner that I attended in the Waldorf; it was not in their apartment.

Mr. JENKINS. Given by David's father and mother?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Attended by Mr. Cohn?

Secretary STEVENS. I understood they gave it.

Mr. JENKINS. By Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn and Mr. Cohn's father, a jurist in New York City, and attended by all of those parties and others, I believe you say.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Including a Mr. and Mrs. Berlin?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you identify them?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Berlin, I believe, is president of the Hearst publications in New York.

Mr. JENKINS. Had pressure been brought to bear upon you at that time on behalf of Schine; that is, at this dinner party given in New York?

Secretary STEVENS. Had pressure been brought to bear on me?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, the question had been up of a commission and various things which I have detailed in the course of my testimony, Mr. Jenkins; yes.

Mr. JENKINS. And you found out that calls had been coming in for David Schine since mid-July, did you not, and you knew it at the time?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you went for the second time and became a guest of this boy's father and mother?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Mr. Jenkins, I was in New York.

Mr. JENKINS. I don't say that there is anything wrong; it is up to the committee to decide that.

Secretary STEVENS. May I give you just a little bit of background on that; that is, that I went to New York on my own initiative, with the invitation of the Senator, to attend the Fort Monmouth hearings on

the 13th and 14th of October. I invited Senator McCarthy and his staff to luncheon with me on both of those days. At some time during the course of October 13, Senator McCarthy invited me to come to dinner that night. Now, I think he had lunch with me and I had dinner with him. I paid no particular attention, frankly, as to where I was going or what we were going to do.

Mr. JENKINS. Was it the next morning that David Schine drove you somewhere in his automobile?

Secretary STEVENS. It was; the morning of October 14.

Mr. JENKINS. October 14?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Are you sure about that date?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. October 14?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Where did he drive you?

Secretary STEVENS. He drove me from the corner of 32d Street and Park Avenue down to the courthouse in lower Manhattan.

Mr. JENKINS. And there was a discussion between you and him then with respect to his Army status, was there not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And I believe you said you knew discussions had been carried on since mid-July.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Or for a period of some 2 or 3 months?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And you knew that he was, in all likelihood, a future draftee?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. Well, I thought he was going to be, but I did not know, of course. It was up to Selective Service entirely.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, did you ever have your photograph taken with G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, there were a lot of photographers around down there at that hearing, and it could be.

Mr. JENKINS. But did you ever at your suggestion at a meeting anywhere, any time, say that "I want my picture taken with David" and have it done?

Secretary STEVENS. I am sure that I never made a statement just like you made it there. I mean, if there was a picture being taken and there were people around, I might be very apt to say, "Well, let us all step in here and have a picture," but I do not think that I ever made any demand to have my picture taken with David Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not say "demand," but was your picture, after David Schine was drafted, ever taken with you alone at your suggestion, anywhere?

Secretary STEVENS. After he was drafted?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Let me show you a picture, Mr. Stevens, for the purpose of refreshing your recollection. I ask you whether or not that is a photograph of you, the Secretary of the Army, and David Schine, a private in the Army.

Secretary STEVENS. I unfortunately can recognize myself, but I could not guarantee the soldier.

Mr. JENKINS. My question is, Is that a photograph of you, the Secretary of the Army, and G. David Schine, a private in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. That is me; that is certainly me, and I assume—

Mr. JENKINS. What do you say about the soldier boy?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not know whether that is Schine or not.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, Mr. Stevens, you know Schine, do you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. You know him well?

Secretary STEVENS. That picture does not look very much like him.

Mr. JENKINS. You have had meetings with him and have been in his home and have been in automobiles with him. What is your best impression about whether or not that was David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I think it probably is.

Mr. JENKINS. You think it probably is?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember when and where it was made?

Secretary STEVENS. This was made at the Maguire Air Force Base.

Senator MUNDT. The photographers will abide by the rule to take their pictures from a kneeling or sitting position. It is difficult for other people to see what is going on.

Senator JACKSON. I could not get the answer to that question.

Senator MUNDT. I will have to ask the photographers to abide by the rule, and that is pretty clear.

Senator JACKSON could not get the answer to the question.

Senator JACKSON. I heard something about Maguire field.

Senator MUNDT. The question was, Where was the picture taken? I think the Secretary has not answered.

Will you repeat the question, Mr. Counsel, and let the Secretary answer it all over again?

Mr. JENKINS. The question was, What was your best impression as to where the picture was taken?

What about that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I am sorry, sir, I hate—

Mr. JENKINS. What is your best impression about that picture, where and when was it taken?

Secretary STEVENS. My best impression of this picture is that it was taken, the title says, and I imagine that is correct, at Maguire Air Force Base, which I referred to earlier this morning, as having been the airport adjoining Fort Dix, where I stopped, and after the meeting in New York, on November 17, which I gave you the detail on this morning. And I would say that this is a picture of, undoubtedly, David Schine, and a rather grim looking picture of the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. JENKINS. After the meeting in New York, of November 17; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. May I hasten to say to you, sir, that I have many, many times had my picture taken with privates of the United States Army, and I hope that I may have that privilege for a long time in the future.

Mr. JENKINS. How many would you say?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, if you took them by groups, like over there in Korea, it would run into the thousands.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, there are about 1½ million of them altogether, are there not?

What had occurred on that meeting of November 17, in New York, in short?

Secretary STEVENS. That was the meeting where I went up to see Senator McCarthy to see if we could get together on the news conference that I had held in Washington on the 13th.

Mr. JENKINS. You went up to make peace with Senator McCarthy, didn't you, to stop this investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I didn't go up there to stop the investigation.

Mr. JENKINS. It wasn't designed for that at all.

Now getting back to Schine now, Mr. Stevens, isn't it a fact that you were being especially nice and considerate and tender of this boy, Schine—wait, wait, wait, wait—in order to dissuade the Senator from continuing his investigation of one of your departments?

Secretary STEVENS. Positively and completely not.

Mr. JENKINS. The treatment you accorded Schine then was just what you accorded every other private in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. I certainly would treat privates in the Army, one and all of them, the same.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, why did you, the Secretary of the Army, having released a statement in which you said that there was no current espionage at Monmouth, why did you, when you found out from Cohn that the Senator was displeased, take it on yourself, in your high position, and having made that statement no doubt with the advice and consent of those around you, including your superiors, to go traipsing off to New York City, hunting up this man, to change your statement and make peace with him, and why then if you weren't afraid of him—

Secretary STEVENS. I did it because I wanted to continue my policy, which is a complete one, of cooperation with the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, you did go up there, and you did make concessions in that statement, you gave it out worded differently, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. As I said, I don't think there was any change in substance, and I didn't so regard it.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, it seemed to pacify the Senator.

Secretary STEVENS. He will have to speak for that, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Mr. Secretary, I call your attention—

Secretary STEVENS. I beg your pardon. I didn't catch that. Did you ask me a question?

Mr. JENKINS. I am about to.

Now, you have denied, emphatically, that, as I understand it, that you even wanted the Senator to discontinue his investigation of Fort Monmouth, is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Jenkins, may I take this opportunity, please, to make a little statement on this subject? I testified last Friday at length with respect to the luncheon meeting of November 6, in my office, where the subject of the Fort Monmouth inquiry was discussed at length. I also indicated—

Mr. JENKINS. I don't think it is responsive to the question. And I object to it.

Senator MUNDT. Will you ask the question and see if we can get the Secretary to respond?

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not this is a part of the testimony you have given in this case on Friday of last week. It is with reference to my question: Did you want him to lay off of you or Fort Monmouth or quit his investigating there. And you denied it.

And I will ask you if you stated this:

Well, we left here by plane and flew to, I think it was, Eatontown, N. J. There was a fair amount of discussion, of course, about the Fort Monmouth discussion on the plane going down. I had gained the impression on the previous meeting, which was the 14th of October, in New York, that Senator McCarthy was approaching the point where he felt that he would turn the prosecution, if you will, of the investigation over to the Army. I think this was discussed some on the plane.

So you did talk to him, I gather from that, about turning the investigation of Fort Monmouth over to the Army, is that correct or not?

Secretary STEVENS. Certainly. But I still think that I am entitled to make a statement I was going to make.

Mr. JENKINS. I certainly think so, too, and there is no disposition to deny you that privilege.

Secretary STEVENS. May I go ahead with that?

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly.

Senator MUNDT. Proceed, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. The point I was going to make is this: that at the November 6 luncheon where the Fort Monmouth thing was discussed, I said I didn't like this constant hammering in the headlines of the Army, because I thought it gave a picture to the public of considerable espionage or spying at Fort Monmouth which was not in accordance with the facts. That is what I objected to. I therefore wanted to handle this job myself, but I specifically said, and I think you will find it in my testimony, that I wanted to make progress reports to Senator McCarthy and that if we weren't doing the job right, I assumed that he would come right back into the picture.

So at no time did I want him to cease and desist unless we were capable of doing the job ourselves, in which case there was no necessity for it, provided I kept him informed as to what was going on.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, it was your idea—and I believe you just reiterated your position—that the time had then come for the Senator to let the Army take over on condition that you render to him from time to time progress reports, and if you weren't doing a masterful job of it, then he would step back in. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is about the way—

Mr. JENKINS. That is about the way it was. Then, Senator—Mr. Stevens—

Senator MUNDT. We all get confused. We have so many generals and Senators and Secretaries.

Mr. JENKINS. I don't know to whom to apologize.

Senator MUNDT. I am sure the recorder will record it properly. Let there be no apology. Just proceed.

Mr. JENKINS. Then what you are saying is that you didn't ask the Senator to stop his investigation of Fort Monmouth, but merely to

suspend it and give you a chance to carry on, and then if you failed, to take over again; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. That is correct. So insofar as his charge against you that you tried to stop the investigation of Fort Monmouth is concerned, that is not correct. You merely tried to get it suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right. I think that you wanted as long a suspension as possible, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I suppose that I probably did. On the other hand, if we didn't do the job and do it properly, I wouldn't want a long suspension. The stakes here were too big. The security of the country was involved. I wanted all the help I could get on doing the job.

Mr. JENKINS. Let me ask you this, Mr. Stevens: Is it not a fact that a suspension is in effect a stoppage just as the Senator has charged?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I wouldn't think so.

Mr. JENKINS. You wouldn't think so; you wouldn't so consider it?

Secretary STEVENS. I think the staff work would go right along, and presumably they would be in constant touch with them. They would give us additional information as it was available. No, I wouldn't say that.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you belong to a social club in New York City called the Merchants Club?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not at the very inception of this matter you, as a member, made arrangements at the Merchants Club for the McCarthy committee to be entertained there, to get their meals there from time to time without any limitation, and that in the end the sum total of the bill was to be sent to you?

Secretary STEVENS. I said that I would like to have them use the club, which was near the courthouse, during that week that hearings were being held, which I think was the week of the 12th to the 16th of November; including the 13th and 14th when I was there. I wanted those facilities to be available to the Senator and his staff if they wanted to use them.

Mr. JENKINS. Then your answer to my question is "Yes."

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. That he, investigating you or the Army, and his staff were to eat at your expense, without let, without hindrance, with no limitation.

Did you think, Mr. Secretary, that it was within the bounds of propriety for you to do that?

Secretary STEVENS. Completely.

Mr. JENKINS. Completely?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That was not done for the purpose of mollifying or pacifying him or anything?

Senator SYMINGTON. I didn't hear the question. Will you repeat it, counsel?

Mr. JENKINS. I said the arrangements to have the Senator and his staff be his guests at his expense, eating and so forth, was not done for

the purpose of mollifying or pacifying the Senator to get him to suspend his investigation of Fort Monmouth.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. JENKINS. What do you say about that?

Secretary STEVENS. I say it certainly was not done for that purpose, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. What purpose was it done for?

Secretary STEVENS. A friendly matter of convenience, when you get right down to it.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, Mr. Stevens, there was quite a scene at Fort Dix on October 20, was there not?

Secretary STEVENS. You mean Fort Monmouth.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to request counsel, if he would, for fear the wrong impression may have been created, to ask the Secretary whether or not we ever accepted the invitation, whether we actually ate at the Merchants Club——

Mr. JENKINS. Did they or did they not avail themselves of that privilege?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes; they did.

Mr. JENKINS. They did? All right.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like——

Senator MUNDT. This has to be a point of order, the Chair insists. Counsel has requested that he not be interrupted in his interrogatories except for a point of order.

Senator JACKSON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. I will recognize Senator McCarthy if he has a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I have, Mr. Chairman. I would like——

Senator MUNDT. What is the point of order? Will you state it first?

Senator McCARTHY. I am not sure if you and I have the same impression of what a point of order is.

Senator MUNDT. May I say that the Chair's impression is that a point of order has to go to the relevancy and the materiality of questions.

Senator McCARTHY. Let the Chair decide whether this is a correct point of order. I would like very much that Mr. Jenkins question the Secretary as to whether or not we ever availed ourselves of that invitation when Mr. Stevens——

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair say he would not construe that to be a point of order but it would be a perfectly proper question for Senator McCarthy to ask Mr. Stevens when he is cross-examining him.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, could I finish my request that counsel go into that matter because I think otherwise there will be the impression created that the Chair and the staff were eating at Mr. Stevens' expense when he was not present. We were his guests on several occasions. He was our guest on several occasions. I think that should be cleared up.

Senator MUNDT. That would not come under the heading of a point of order as far as the chairman is concerned. It is a proper question for Senator McCarthy to ask; it is a proper question for anybody to ask. But the rules of procedure are that there be interruptions only for points of order.

Senator Jackson, have you a point of order?

Senator JACKSON. I have this point of order. I would like, and I think it is important, that a clarification be made as to the rules that apply to all of us up here at the head table. Do I understand—

Senator SYMINGTON. Can we fix the microphones so that the questions are asked and understood?

Senator JACKSON. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I can make a point of order and request that a question be asked by counsel?

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has just ruled on that to say that a point of order can be asked only dealing with questions of materiality or relevancy. So I would think not, on whether you could challenge any question being asked on that basis.

Senator JACKSON. I think these rules should be strictly enforced.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has ruled on the point of order in conformity with Senator Jackson's position. Counsel may proceed.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, you have told about the events of October 20 when you say there was an explosion on the part of Roy Cohn; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. That was at Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. Fort Monmouth; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. When he was not admitted to the holy of holies, so to speak?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And you were told the substance of the statements made by Mr. Cohn on that occasion, were you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Why, Mr. Stevens, did you see fit, considering your high office, to publicly there and in the presence of all who were convened, offer an apology for what you had considered a proper and correct act on your part?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, first of all, it wasn't public.

Mr. JENKINS. It was in the presence of all those assembled there, was it not?

Secretary STEVENS. It was.

Mr. JENKINS. That is what my question embraces.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes; but it was not a public statement.

Mr. JENKINS. Why did you do that?

Secretary STEVENS. And also, the question came up about it the other day, about whether or not that was an apology, and I said I would like to think that over; that first I said it was, but I wasn't sure that was exactly the right word.

Mr. JENKINS. May I read your testimony. It is brief, and the committee will decide whether it is an apology or not.

Well, I said it was too bad there wasn't time available at the door of the laboratory to make all of the necessary inquiries about who was cleared for what, and therefore I made that on-the-spot decision, and I certainly did not intend to offend anybody by it, but I did the best I could and I did not intend it as any offense to Mr. Cohn or anyone else.

Mr. JENKINS. Was that in the nature of an apology, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say that it was.

Secretary STEVENS. Will you read on, sir?

Mr. JENKINS (reading):

Very well, you may proceed.

Secretary STEVENS. I would say it was in the nature of an apology.

Now, if I am not reading correctly, I invite your counsel to come up here and check it.

I don't know, sir. I am trying to rethink that one over as to whether "apology" is the right word. I think that I had not done anything that was wrong on the one hand, and I felt it in my heart I had done what was right, and I tried to protect the interests of the United States.

Now, that is it in full.

Now, Mr. Secretary, the question is this: Why did you, in your exalted position as head of the Army, so to speak, there on that occasion, after you had done what you said was right and proper, in the presence of all those assembled humble yourself, so to speak, or kowtow to this young man, and make that statement, whether it could be construed as an apology or not, if it wasn't designed, if it wasn't a part of a pattern on your part to at all times keep the good will of the McCarthy committee so that they would lay off of you and Fort Monmouth? What is your explanation of that?

Secretary STEVENS. My explanation is that it was part of my desire to work with the committees of Congress. I had no thought, in trying to smooth over the feelings of Mr. Cohn, that I was in any way attempting to stop the investigation. I think from the latter part of the language you read from my previous testimony, that that word "apology" hit me pretty fast, and as I look back on it, Mr. Jenkins, I am not sure I know exactly what the right word to use on the darned thing is. I think it was—I know it was an effort on my part to smooth over a situation which had gotten a little bit out of hand as far as Mr. Cohn was concerned, and I guess we have all been faced with situations like that, where we tried to make some appropriate remark that would make the fellow who feels he was offended feel a little bit better about it, and that is what I attempted to do. The word that applies to it, I leave to you, sir, in those circumstances.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you know a lieutenant named Corr?

Secretary STEVENS. I met him, and I don't know him.

Mr. JENKINS. Have you learned that when that alleged explosion took place, and I wasn't there, and I don't know what was said, that a lieutenant in the Army named Corr went to a high-ranking officer there, and said, "Why do we have to take such insults from Mr. Cohn; why do we have to cater to him?" and have you learned that young man said that?

Secretary STEVENS. I heard that.

Mr. JENKINS. Have you promoted him?

Senator McCLELLAN. Let us get his answer, and I don't know what he said.

Senator MUNDT. To the last question.

Secretary STEVENS. As far as I know he has not been promoted.

Senator SYMINGTON. Can we identify whom we are talking about?

Secretary STEVENS. He is the aide to General Lawton, the commanding general.

Senator SYMINGTON. Apparently the Democratic microphones aren't working; they are getting a little better now.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, we have discussed the question of whether or not you sought to discredit the McCarthy committee, and the other charge is that you sought improperly to stop its investigation of Fort Monmouth.

I read you now an excerpt from your testimony given last Friday, and I ask you to state whether or not it is correct, to wit:

Now, at the luncheon, I discussed with them the Fort Monmouth investigation, and I told them that I felt that it had served its purpose.

What does that mean if it doesn't mean that you told them that it was at an end or should be suspended?

Secretary STEVENS. By that I meant, Mr. Jenkins, that it served the purpose of certainly bringing this thing to the forceful attention of the Department of the Army, and the Secretary, and all of us. That is what I meant by "served its purpose," as I think you will find there.

Mr. JENKINS. Now let me read on and see if that is what it means.

That we were on top of everything that they had given us, and we were following up, and we had had information on every name that had been turned up anyway, and that I wanted to have the Army carry out, and if you will, subject of this committee, in the sense that I said I would render progress reports as to how we were doing.

That, in substance, is what you said, and——

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And I repeat, wasn't that a request for a suspension by the Senator of his activities?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, as I have explained before, sir, I didn't like this hammering of the Army over the head, and that is the thing that was bothering me, and it wasn't the investigation itself. I wanted the Army to handle this, and try to get the situation back into reasonable perspective insofar as the public was concerned.

In addition, we had a morale problem.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, do you recall that their charges, some mention is made about you appealing to the Senator personally on the idea that you would be driven from your job if he didn't quit and let you alone and discontinue his investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. I testified on Friday that if this thing was pursued and the erroneous impression was getting out to the public, if that was continued, that it could well result in driving me from office.

Senator McCarthy said that that isn't what he wanted.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember the specifications in his charge that you at the Pentagon in your office told the McCarthy committee that if they did not lay off of you and discontinue these investigations that you had been in office only 10 months and it would result in your dismissal from office? Was such a charge made by them?

Secretary STEVENS. That language, Mr. Jenkins, I do not accept at all.

Mr. JENKINS. But that is the charge made in substance in the writing, in the specification?

Secretary STEVENS. And I do not accept it at all.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand that. Now let us see how close, Mr. Secretary, you come to having made that statement. I repeat your testimony of last Friday. This is Secretary Stevens:

It isn't cut off, Mr. Jenkins, but I think this is important, that in respect to the matter that I mentioned before, namely, the hammering over the head of the Army persistently, creating the impression that there was espionage in a big way at Fort Monmouth which I say was not so, that I told Senator McCarthy and his associates that I had been in office for 10 months, and I had some

responsibilities that I had assumed, and that if they kept on with these headlines which in my opinion were utterly unfair, that they could drive me out of office if they wanted to.

You did say that, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; I certainly did, and I stand on it.

Mr. JENKINS. Wasn't that, Mr. Stevens, a personal appeal to a United States Senator and the members of his staff to at least suspend, which I believe you have already admitted you asked them to do? Wasn't this an additional appeal to quit or suspend so that you could continue your tenure of office beyond that 10-month period?

Secretary STEVENS. I wasn't thinking a thing about my tenure of office, Mr. Jenkins. I didn't ask for this position.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand that, but why did you mention it? You said you had been in office only 10 months.

Secretary STEVENS. I wanted to have the Department of the Army and the United States Army treated fairly, and I felt it was not being treated fairly.

Mr. JENKINS. Was this investigation of Fort Monmouth an unfair treatment of the Army, considering the results obtained?

Secretary STEVENS. The results so far as the publicity was concerned were extremely unfair.

Mr. JENKINS. But as far as the results obtained outside of the publicity, was it unfair to the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, no; it was not unfair to the Army to speed up the suspension by a certain length of time of a certain number of cases. That was perfectly O. K. But it was not fair to the Army, and it was not fair to the American people, to create in the minds of the public and of the services the idea that there was a lot of current espionage going on at Fort Monmouth when such was not the case.

Senator MUNDT. Counsel advises he wants to start on another line of questioning. It is 12:30, so we will suspend until 2:30 this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 2:30 p. m. of the same day.)

7433 S. 41-275
Sent

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES
AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY
OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN
G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR
JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND
FRANCIS P. CARR.

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

PURSUANT TO
S. Res. 189

PART 6

APRIL 26, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

JUL 15 1954

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	ALTON A. LENNON, North Carolina

RICHARD J. O'MELIA, *General Counsel*

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

RAY H. JENKINS, *Chief Counsel*

THOMAS R. PREWITT, *Assistant Counsel*

ROBERT A. COLLIER, *Assistant Counsel*

SOLIS HORWITZ, *Assistant Counsel*

CHARLES A. MANER, *Secretary*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Testimony of Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary, Department of the Army—	214

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES AND
COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE
HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN,
AND FRANCIS P. CARR

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

AFTER RECESS

(The hearing was resumed at 2:40 p. m.)

Present: Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota, chairman; Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Senator Charles E. Potter, Republican, Michigan; Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Idaho; Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Also present: Ray H. Jenkins, chief counsel to the subcommittee. Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel. Ruth Y. Watt, chief clerk.

Also present: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin; Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Francis P. Carr, executive director of the subcommittee; Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army; John G. Adams, counselor to the Army; H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Joseph N. Welch, special counsel for the Army; James D. St. Clair, special counsel for the Army; and Frederick P. Bryan, counsel to H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. We will proceed.

Mr. WELCH. I want to say a word of thanks to you, sir; and I spoke of your great power a day or two ago, and on that occasion I had no microphone and now I have not one and not two but three.

Senator MUNDT. That is good.

Before the questioning resumes the Chair would like to make a statement on behalf of the committee. When I returned to the office this noon, I found that we have had a great deluge of telegrams from across the country accusing the committee of stopping some of the live TV broadcasts, and they are complaining because the broadcasts that they were receiving on Thursday and Friday are no longer available.

The Chair simply wants to restate the policy of the committee concerning television and radio. We stated that the hearings would be open for television cameras and for radio reporting provided it was

done without revenue to the broadcasting companies in the nature of sponsored advertising.

We have no control, nor do we desire to exercise any, over which networks carry the programs and which do not. Certainly the television cameras are no convenience to the witnesses, I am sure, and no convenience to the committee members. But we labor in this highly illuminated atmosphere solely in the interest of giving the public the full set of facts on television, on radio, if the networks desire to provide them as a public service.

Neither does the committee assume any responsibility for any broadcasts which are screened or cut or replayed which do not cover the entire proceedings of the hearings. Any complaints that the public has to make concerning prejudice or bias for partial and fragmentary reports should be directed to the broadcast companies and not to the committee.

Mr. Jenkins may proceed with the questioning.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT T. STEVENS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY—Resumed

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with further cross-examination of Mr. Stevens, I think it proper at this time to state for the purposes of identification that the gentleman sitting on the immediate left of Mr. Struve Hensel who has now been declared a party in interest to this controversy is his personal attorney, Mr. Frederick Bryan, of New York City.

Mr. Stevens, as I recall, the last question I asked you prior to adjournment for the lunch hour was whether or not in your opinion this investigation of Fort Monmouth was unfair to the Army considering the results obtained. A transcript of the record discloses that your answer was as follows:

The results insofar as the publicity was concerned were extremely unfair.

Do you recall giving that as your answer to that question?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you this, Mr. Stevens: Do you not think that it was a salutary thing for the American public to know that there was an active agency such as the McCarthy committee investigating alleged infiltration of Communists in the Army and other departments of the Government?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; I think it was a good thing.

Mr. JENKINS. A good thing for the public and a bad thing for the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. A good thing for the public to know, sir; and, as I said before, I completely favor working with these committees in investigations, and the only thing that I objected to was the manner in which the hearings were held and the publicity was generated.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, on or about the 10th day of March of this year, you released a document called A Series of Events, and which was published in the newspapers, as I recall, on March 11; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. When you say "released," sir, we sent them to the members of this committee and to the Members of the Congress who had asked for it, and we did not make it public.

Mr. JENKINS. It was made public, however, on the 11th day of March, was it?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And the countercharges or certain memoranda of the McCarthy committee were released the following day?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And I believe that this series of events which you sent to certain members of this committee contained how many different events? Anyway, it was embodied in approximately 34 pages; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And it was published in the newspapers?

Secretary STEVENS. It was published.

Mr. JENKINS. When did you begin the preparation of that, Mr. Stevens, of that document, consisting of 34 pages?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I didn't prepare it.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask who did prepare it?

Secretary STEVENS. It was prepared in the office of or under the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

Mr. JENKINS. What is his name?

Secretary STEVENS. His name is Mr. Hensel.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Struve Hensel?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Now a party of interest?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. You say it was prepared in his office?

Secretary STEVENS. I said under his supervision in his office.

Mr. JENKINS. Who did prepare it?

Secretary STEVENS. The gentleman that I talked to was Mr. Brown.

Mr. JENKINS. And the preparation of that was supervised by Mr. Struve Hensel?

Secretary STEVENS. That I believe is correct. And I think it is covered by the letter that transmitted the chronology to Senator Potter.

Mr. JENKINS. Have you read Mr. Hensel's reply?

Secretary STEVENS. Actually I have not read it in detail; no, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Have you read of it in the newspapers and you know what it is in the main?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know that he disclaims any personal knowledge whatsoever of the events that occurred from mid-July up until your last contact with Senator McCarthy on January 14?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think he had any connection with it at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Not only had any connection with it, but he had no knowledge of it, did he?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think he had any knowledge of it.

Mr. JENKINS. Any knowledge of it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Can you explain why he supervised the preparation of it?

Secretary STEVENS. Why he supervised the preparation of it?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; not having any personal knowledge?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, he later began to have knowledge of it, and I think that you said up to January 14, and I think Mr. Hensel began to have knowledge of it somewhere around about the 26th or 25th of February.

Mr. JENKINS. You say there was a Mr. Brown who actually prepared it?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Brown, I understand, is in the General Counsel's office in the Department of Defense.

Mr. JENKINS. Where did Mr. Brown get his information upon which he prepared that 34-page document?

Secretary STEVENS. He called upon the Department of the Army to submit its files containing the material related to it.

Mr. JENKINS. Did the files contain all reports of all these conversations, Mr. Stevens, or was the report made by you or Mr. Adams from memory?

Secretary STEVENS. I only know about the part that I was connected with myself. That is, Mr. Brown came to the office and we discussed the parts of which I had direct knowledge.

Mr. JENKINS. From time to time, in early September, beginning with your trip from Montana back to Washington, did you daily, or upon the occurrence of these events, make a memorandum of them, or did you later, just prior to March and in early March, from memory compile a record of these events?

Secretary STEVENS. Most of my material was from memory. Some of it was from memoranda, letters, and other things.

Mr. JENKINS. You have testified about a meeting in the Schine apartment on September 16.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you if it isn't a fact that that meeting is not mentioned in either this 34-page compilation of events nor in the specifications?

While your attorney is looking for that information, will you give us the full name or the initials of the Mr. Brown who prepared this 34-page document under the supervision of Mr. Hensel, and his official position with the Department of Defense?

Secretary STEVENS. I will get it for you, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Very good.

I ask you if it isn't a fact—as I understand it, you testified here last Thursday or Friday—Friday, I am sure—that on the occasion of this meeting in the Schine apartment in New York City on September 16, Senator McCarthy asked you for a commission for David Schine? Isn't it a fact, Mr. Stevens, that in neither this 34-page document entitled "Events" or the specifications filed as charges here was such a meeting mentioned? Is that correct or not?

Secretary STEVENS. I think it is, but that is being checked, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Can you explain to this committee why such an important event as that, in which this first request allegedly was made by the Senator to you was omitted from both the events and the specifications?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't know why it was.

Mr. JENKINS. You don't know why?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you think that your recollection now as you testify here under oath is better than it was when these events and the specifications were prepared?

Secretary STEVENS. I suppose as I have thought about this thing, my memory naturally has been sharpened up, Mr. Jenkins, on some points. As to why that particular item was not in, if it was not in, I just don't know.

Mr. JENKINS. You certainly gave it serious consideration before that list of events was prepared, did you not, Mr. Stevens?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I don't know that I did. I don't know that that chronology originally published was necessarily intended to cover every single thing. Mr. Brown will have to tell us about that.

Mr. JENKINS. As we understand it, that is the first overt act on the part of the Senator in seeking preferential treatment for David Schine. Now, is your explanation of the leaving of that out in the events and the specifications, a lack of memory on the subject; or that you forgot to include it? Is that your explanation?

Secretary STEVENS. I just don't know why it was left out.

Mr. JENKINS. You testified further about a meeting on September 21 here in Washington. I will ask you whether or not on that occasion General Partridge was present?

Secretary STEVENS. I think he was.

Mr. JENKINS. Isn't it a fact that likewise in both your 34-page document entitled "Events" and your specifications, that meeting was entirely omitted?

Secretary STEVENS. That was an executive meeting of this committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that your reason for having omitted it in your events as well as in the specifications, the fact that it was an executive meeting?

Secretary STEVENS. It was an executive meeting, yes, and I didn't consider, since the issues here were not discussed, that there was any particular reason to include that executive meeting of this committee.

Mr. JENKINS. You have included in both your events and specifications, references to certain executive meetings, have you not, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right; yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Then do we understand that the reason it was omitted was not because it was an executive meeting, but because there was nothing of interest discussed? Is that now your explanation?

Secretary STEVENS. I wouldn't say that there was nothing in the course of the hearing that was not of interest discussed, but it was an executive session and I would not have felt at liberty to discuss it.

Mr. JENKINS. There were discussions bearing upon the issues of this controversy, were there not, Mr. Stevens, and to which you testified in your direct examination?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that General Partridge did appear as a witness, yes. I don't know whether it had to do with the issues which we are talking about here or not.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you identify General Partridge and where he fitted into your scheme of things in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. General Partridge was the Assistant Chief of Staff G-2, which is in charge of intelligence.

Mr. JENKINS. In charge of intelligence?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. It was a part of his duty to investigate the infiltration of Communists or espionage in the Army, wasn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you later remove him from that post?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir. We had a new Chief of Staff come in in August of last year, and in the course of the new Chief of Staff taking over, it is the perfectly normal procedure for him to make changes in the Chief of Staff positions. He made a number of them, including General Partridge.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know when General Partridge was relieved from his post of intelligence?

Secretary STEVENS. I can't remember the exact date.

Mr. JENKINS. Approximately.

Secretary STEVENS. I should think it was probably November.

Mr. JENKINS. While the McCarthy investigation was in progress, wasn't it, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary STEVENS. I think so, yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You think so. Isn't it a fact that you told Senator McCarthy and members of his staff that Partridge knew nothing whatever about intelligence or the duties pertaining to that particular post?

Secretary STEVENS. That is positively not a fact.

Mr. JENKINS. Positively not the fact. He was removed not by you but by the Secretary of Defense or Chief of Staff?

Secretary STEVENS. The Chief of Staff. General Ridgway made changes in his staff and he brought in General Trudeau from Korea as G-2 in charge of intelligence.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, you further testified on direct examination about a meeting of September 28. Do you recall that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I don't recall that.

Mr. JENKINS. You don't recall that?

Secretary STEVENS. At the moment, no, I don't. Could you refresh my memory on it?

Mr. JENKINS. Be that as it may, the meeting of September 28 is mentioned neither in the 34-page compilation of events nor the specifications. That is correct, isn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. The record will show, of course, what your testimony was about the meeting of September 28.

Now, on September 29 I will ask you whether or not that was the occasion of the wedding day of Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. It was.

Mr. JENKINS. You attended that wedding?

Secretary STEVENS. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Upon the invitation of the Senator?

Secretary STEVENS. Correct.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you if you didn't sit at that wedding or stand with one G. David Schine.

Secretary STEVENS. In very close proximity to him.

Mr. JENKINS. In close proximity to him, and talked to him on that occasion?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you make an engagement to see him at a later date on that occasion?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think I did.

Mr. JENKINS. You don't think you did? Do you deny that you did?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not recall that I did.

Mr. JENKINS. If you did, would you have any idea of the purpose of a future meeting between you, the Secretary of the Army, and this boy who was not then in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes. I think it entirely possible that David Schine, if he wanted to talk to me, wanted to talk about his future military position.

Mr. JENKINS. But didn't you initiate the conversation and tell him that the following day, or shortly thereafter, you wanted to see him and talk to him, and that it was no time or place to talk to him on the wedding day of the Senator?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall that.

Mr. JENKINS. You don't recall it and you don't deny it?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall it and I do not deny it.

Mr. JENKINS. Will you examine there, and I am sure your lawyer will assist you, your events of October 2. And while that is being done, let me ask you the question: Isn't it a fact that in the document referred to as "Events," you state that Roy Cohn spoke to you about David Schine on October 2, whereas in your specifications you say that both Cohn and Carr sought special favors for David Shine?

State whether or not that is the fact. And if you have any explanation of that discrepancy, you may give it to the committee at this time.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I think that I said, in my testimony on this point, that Mr. Cohn did most of the talking on the subject. I do not recall.

Mr. JENKINS. Your specifications are before you, and you may be positive about it, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, could I say a word about this case—now I hear myself. Mr. Jenkins would be quick to say that our specifications were prepared with great speed and under great pressure. I am frank to say they were finished in the small hours of the morning. I think Mr. Jenkins would do me the credit of saying we were more closely on schedule on our specifications than was the other side.

Be that as it may. They were also the specifications, or also based on information from Mr. Adams. But I would like, although it is not comfortable for me to say so, that if there are defects in the specifications of omission, the chances are very good that my young friend whom I so greatly admire, and myself, are very much to blame.

Mr. Stevens did not stand at my standup disks late at night while we whipped those out. It was Mr. St. Clair and I who did it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, it is of course a difficult task to interrupt such a gracious gentleman as Mr. Welch, but those are proper matters for him to show on cross-examination; and your opportunity will come.

Now, Mr. Stevens—

Mr. WELCH. I beg your pardon.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Stevens, did you not go to Mr. Allen Dulles on October 15, with reference to David Schine, and particularly with reference to getting a commission for him?

Secretary STEVENS. I went to Mr. Dulles, but it was not on October 15.

Mr. JENKINS. When was it?

Secretary STEVENS. It was on the 28th, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I beg your pardon.

Secretary STEVENS. October 28.

Mr. JENKINS. You went personally. Who was Allen Dulles at the time?

Secretary STEVENS. He was director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and still is.

Mr. JENKINS. And that is a Department of the Army where men especially qualified in investigations are sent for training and for commissioning?

Secretary STEVENS. No. It is a completely independent agency, and it has nothing to do with the Army, except to the extent that its work is coordinated with Army and other military services.

Mr. JENKINS. You say that was on October 28?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Nearly 2 months after you say these importunities started by the committee for favors for Schine, is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right, yes.

Mr. JENKINS. At whose instance did you go to see Allen Dulles, was it your own, or that of the Senator, or Mr. Cohn, or anyone else?

Secretary STEVENS. This matter came up on the telephone, and Mr. Cohn called me and said that he had two matters in mind with respect to Mr. Schine. One was a possible furlough that might be granted immediately on Mr. Schine's being inducted, and the other was the possibility that CIA might have some use for Mr. Schine.

I said, "Well, I will go and ask Mr. Dulles if he can use Mr. Schine." And I did that. And he said that he could not use him, and I so reported to Mr. Cohn.

Mr. JENKINS. If he could use Mr. Schine in what capacity?

Secretary STEVENS. In any capacity.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, did you consider that an act on your part designed to favor David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I considered it as an act of cooperation as a result of the telephone conversation when Mr. Cohn called me with respect to David Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not mention is made of that act on your part, regardless of how this committee construes it, in either the 34-page compilation of events or the specifications?

Secretary STEVENS. I will ask if I may, that the attorney look that up and see. I can't answer it at the moment.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you ever tell Schine, yourself, that you wanted him in Intelligence?

Secretary STEVENS. That I wanted him in Intelligence?

Mr. JENKINS. Right.

Secretary STEVENS. No, I don't remember that. I have talked, I remember, in the early part of this thing there was a good deal of discussion like the time I rode down with him in the car from uptown

New York, which I discussed on Friday. Intelligence matters were discussed.

Mr. JENKINS. With Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. And that was during the period of the McCarthy investigation, wasn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, that was not a part of your pattern to hold this boy Schine as a sort of a hostage, and use him as a bait for the purpose of abating this investigating, was it?

Secretary STEVENS. Certainly not, and if he was a hostage, so are hundreds of thousands if not millions of young American hostages when they are doing their duty in the service of their country.

Senator MUNDT. May I inquire whether the counsel has produced the information so that the Secretary can answer the question which is being held in abeyance?

Mr. St. Clair, are you ready?

Mr. ST. CLAIR. I cannot find it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe you had a meeting about which you testified on November 6, Mr. Secretary, in your office; did you not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And will you tell us again who was there?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, Cohn, Carr, Adams, and myself, for one-half of the meeting; and then for the last half of the meeting General Ridgway, General Trudeau, and General Mudgett.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not, Mr. Secretary, you on that occasion likewise invited one G. David Schine to attend as your guest, November 6, at which time you had the table set and had a chair there for G. David Schine and then expressed great disappointment that he did not attend with the Senator and his staff?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, David Schine at this time was in the Army, and he had gone in on November 3, and he was assigned as you know in the first instance to temporary duty, First Army, in New York, with the idea of being available for committee work.

Now, if David Schine was in Washington, on that particular day, I would have been glad to have him come along as a member of the staff of this committee. I do not recall having specifically invited him to the luncheon.

Mr. JENKINS. You say he was in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Don't you know that he did not report to Fort Dix until November 10, 4 days after the date about which I am questioning you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I know that.

Mr. JENKINS. Very well. Now, Mr. Secretary, I observe that in answer to certain questions I ask you, you are extremely positive, and here you don't appear to be, apparently.

I ask you again, isn't it a fact that you specifically requested Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn to bring G. David Schine to the Pentagon to your office on November 6, for a luncheon with you?

Secretary STEVENS. If he was in town, I would have been delighted to have him.

Mr. JENKINS. That I submit, Mr. Chairman, is not an answer to my question.

Now, I ask it again, did you or did you not, on November 6, invite David Schine to the Pentagon to your office for lunch with Senator? Secretary STEVENS. I definitely do not recall having done so.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, to refresh your recollection, do you remember, Mr. Secretary, that you had a table set with food, all ready for all your guests, and that there was one vacant chair there?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall that detail. It may well have been.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember that that was for the absent invitee, G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I do not recall that.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember telling Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn that you were especially disappointed that David Schine did not attend?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you deny it?

Secretary STEVENS. Do I deny it?

Mr. JENKINS. Do you deny inviting David Schine to your—

Secretary STEVENS. I have no recollection of having invited David Schine. I would have been delighted for him to come.

Mr. JENKINS. You would have been delighted for him to come?

Secretary STEVENS. If they wanted to bring him as a member of the staff.

Mr. JENKINS. In spite of all of these terrific efforts to high-pressure you, you still would have been delighted for David Schine to come on November 6?

Secretary STEVENS. For the reason that the Fort Monmouth investigation was the principal subject for discussion.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you not tell Senator McCarthy and Roy Cohn on that occasion, the 6th, that you wanted your picture taken with David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I doubt very much that I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you doubt any other event of November 6 about which I have asked you? You seem to be pretty positive about the picture, and rather hazy about whether you invited him there or not?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not recall having invited David Schine.

Mr. JENKINS. If the Senator and Roy Cohn and others testify that is the fact, you are not in a position to deny it? Is that what you are saying?

Secretary STEVENS. I would like to hear the testimony.

Mr. JENKINS. You would like to hear their testimony.

What possibly could have been your purpose in inviting David Schine there on the 6th day of November to lunch with you, the Secretary of the Army, if it were not for the purpose of offering tidbits, so to speak, sweet morsels of tidbits to lull to sleep this three-headed monster that you say was about to devour you?

Secretary STEVENS. I certainly had no such idea, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Why would you have wanted him there if not for that reason?

Secretary STEVENS. Only because he was a member of Senator McCarthy's staff, and if Senator McCarthy wanted him to come, it would have been perfectly all right with me.

Mr. JENKINS. He was then a draftee in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Great pressure had been exerted upon you, you say——

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. For preferential treatment.

Secretary STEVENS. Right.

Mr. JENKINS. And yet in spite of all that, and in spite of all this investigation that was going on, you now deny that the only purpose you could possibly have had in mind in getting him there was to pacify the Senator and get him off of your neck at Fort Monmouth?

Secretary STEVENS. I completely deny that.

Mr. JENKINS. Of that, now, you are positive?

Secretary STEVENS. I am 100-percent sure.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, thank goodness I am about through. One other serious charge has been made against you, and that is, from time to time you offered up a bigger bait even than David Schine to this committee to let you alone, to wit, the Air Force or the Navy, it being alleged that you tried to divert this committee from the Army to the Air Force or the Navy. What do you say about that charge?

Secretary STEVENS. I say it is an unequivocal lie.

Mr. JENKINS. That is one phase of this investigation about which your memory hasn't failed you?

Secretary STEVENS. It certainly has not.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to read you an excerpt from your testimony. I believe you have admitted that you did try to prevail upon the committee to suspend the operations as far as the investigation of Fort Monmouth is concerned.

Secretary STEVENS. I wanted to change the type of hearing. As far as the investigation was concerned, it could go right along.

Mr. JENKINS. This is from the record of April 23:

Question:

Now you were telling about a statement you made to the effect that if this thing continued and these headlines were emblazoned upon the front page of the papers, it would drive you out of office.

I believe you admitted that. Here is the answer you gave:

I said that it could; that such a thing could happen. And Senator McCarthy said that that was not his intention. We discussed further the question of how to handle this Fort Monmouth situation. Senator McCarthy then said that he was planning to look into some situations in industrial plants, and I stated that the Army and in fact the whole Defense Department was very much interested in that subject and had problems connected with it.

I will ask you, wasn't that, Mr. Stevens, an invitation on your part——

Secretary STEVENS. It was not.

Mr. JENKINS. Wait. I haven't finished.

[Continuing:] To seek to divert Senator McCarthy and his staff from the Army to industrial plants and other phases not connected with the Army? Wasn't that there your intention when you stated that?

Secretary STEVENS. It definitely was not. If you want me to give you a little background on that——

Mr. JENKINS. Did you ever intimate or suggest or did your attorney, Mr. Adams, to your knowledge ever suggest, that there was a

ripe, juicy field in other departments of the Army or in the Air Force or in the Navy for investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. Never.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know of a map that was on one occasion drawn by your attorney, Mr. Adams?

Secretary STEVENS. I have heard of it. I never saw it.

Mr. JENKINS. It was drawn during the course of a conversation between him and Roy Cohn, wasn't it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is what I have been told.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you make an investigation of that?

Secretary STEVENS. An investigation of the map?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, of why your lawyer would draw a map in the presence of Roy Cohn, showing the different departments of the United States Army, the different areas.

Secretary STEVENS. No, I didn't make any investigation about it.

Mr. JENKINS. All right, then you deny that what you said to the Senator with respect to investigating industrial plants was designed to get a suspension or to divert him to some other field of endeavor? Is that your testimony?

Secretary STEVENS. Exactly.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe, Mr. Chairman, you may take the witness.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. Jenkins. In approximately 90 minutes you will have another chance.

In my 10 minutes I would like to start, Mr. Stevens, by reading the first paragraph of your specifications, dated April 13. It says:

The Department of the Army alleges that Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (hereinafter called the subcommittee) of the United States Senate, and its chief counsel, Roy M. Cohn, as well as other members of its staff, sought by improper means to obtain preferential treatment for one David G. Schine, United States Army, formerly chief consultant of the subcommittee, in that—

Then it lists 29 specifications.

I would like now to break down the specific parts, insofar as your own personal knowledge is involved, that each of the three, to wit, Carr, Cohn, and McCarthy, may have played in the specific manner of utilizing improper means to obtain preferential treatment. Let's go first to Mr. Carr.

Are there any specific occasions, to your personal knowledge, that Mr. Carr used improper means to obtain preferential treatment for Private G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I indicated this morning that in the meetings that Mr. Carr attended, he was—

Senator MUNDT. Passive.

Secretary STEVENS. Passive about it, and Mr. Cohn did most of the talking. However, Mr. Adams had far more meetings with Mr. Carr than I did.

Senator MUNDT. I am questioning you solely now from the standpoint of your own personal knowledge.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Part of the task of this subcommittee is to find out one by one about these three individuals, whether they used improper means. I am talking now strictly about Mr. Carr and strictly about your own personal knowledge. At any time did Mr. Carr engage in improper means, in your opinion, to seek preferential treatment for G. David Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Not nearly to the extent that Cohn did.

Senator MUNDT. To what extent and on what occasions?

Secretary STEVENS. It is very hard to define, Mr. Chairman, and I am not trying to evade it. I think Frank Carr took a relatively inactive part in the whole situation that we are discussing so far as my personal knowledge is concerned.

Senator MUNDT. In all events, Mr. Carr has been charged in this presentation with some very serious misbehavior.

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator MUNDT. In justice to you and in justice to him, I think our committee should know specifically when and what he did which was improper.

Secretary STEVENS. I think that will no doubt come out—

Senator MUNDT. Insofar as you know.

Secretary STEVENS. Insofar as I know, a relatively inactive part.

Senator MUNDT. Does the Chair understand that insofar as you know, you absolve him of engaging in improper means, and if not, when and where did he do something improper?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I would say this: I think Mr. Carr might have been a little more active in trying to stop some of the conversations that went on, and he did not do that.

Senator MUNDT. What did he do positively that was improper?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, he would sit there and listen to Cohn make these statements and possibly in a mild way take part, but nothing, I say, of more than a passive or inactive nature so far as my personal knowledge of Carr is concerned.

Senator MUNDT. Well, may I say, Mr. Stevens, that I think that you owe it to the committee and to Mr. Carr, either to say that insofar as your own personal knowledge is concerned you absolve him of charges of improper treatment, or that you specify the way and the time in which he was improper.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I will have to do a little thinking about that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. You may think.

Secretary STEVENS. Do you mean I have to think right now?

Senator MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. Carr is being charged right now and I think you should be specific about it.

Secretary STEVENS. He is being charged by the Department of the Army, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. I am not trying to absolve him as a result of your testimony, but I am trying to find out whether your testimony implicates him or absolves him.

Secretary STEVENS. I would say the testimony of others would implicate him far more than any testimony of mine.

Senator MUNDT. Let us stick to the testimony of Bob Stevens and the information that Bob Stevens has for our committee.

Of your own personal knowledge, are you charging him with improper treatment, improper means or improper inducements, or intimidation; or are you as far as your own personal relationships are concerned absolving him?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I say, I think that Carr could have stepped up and stopped some of this conversation that went on, and he didn't do it on the other hand.

Senator MUNDT. Is that the extent of your charge, that Mr. Carr failed to step up and stop either Senator McCarthy or Mr. Cohn from saying things that you think they should not have said?

Secretary STEVENS. If he had given any indication of doing that, I would absolve him.

Senator MUNDT. Is that the extent of your charge, that he failed to step up to stop them from saying things that you thought were improper?

Secretary STEVENS. As I say, Carr took part in a minor way, in these discussions that took place.

Senator MUNDT. What did he do beyond failing to step up to stop Senator McCarthy or Mr. Cohn from saying things that you thought were improper; what else did he do, if anything?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, one very brief point of order, I think that the record should show that Mr. Carr has no jurisdiction over my chief counsel, Mr. Cohn, nor over the chairman.

Senator MUNDT. That is something that you may bring up in cross-examination, and I don't believe that is a point of order. I don't suppose that Mr. Stevens would be in possession of that information.

I am trying to find out, in justice to Mr. Carr, and I am sure that you want to be fair——

Secretary STEVENS. I do.

Senator MUNDT. Just exactly the extent of the charge that you are now leveling from your own personal knowledge against Mr. Carr.

You have said that you charge him with sitting there passively and not trying to stop Senator McCarthy or Mr. Cohn when they talked to you about Schine.

Secretary STEVENS. And taking minor parts in the conversation.

Senator MUNDT. The chairman's time has expired.

Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Secretary, what authority do you have with respect to granting commissions in the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Commissions?

Senator McCLELLAN. Yes. Direct commissions as was requested for Mr. Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I never have granted one.

Senator McCLELLAN. Who has the authority? And I want to decide the source of the appeal and of whom it was made, and what you did about it.

Assuming that his application had been found proper and he was qualified, who would have made the decision to grant a commission or who made the decisions to reject the request?

(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

Senator McCLELLAN. Do we have to have that much conference to find out who had authority to grant a direct commission?

Secretary STEVENS. Most of that, most of that was delegated, the authority for that delegated to the technical services, that is, like the Corps of Engineers, or the Judge Advocate General, or the Chemical Corps.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, who, what position, or who occupies what position can accept or approve an application for a direct commission and grant it?

Secretary STEVENS. The chief of a technical service in my name.

Senator McCLELLAN. In your name?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do they come to you directly?

Secretary STEVENS. No.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do they ever reach you?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you ever pass judgment on them?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. It is done by somebody under your command or under your direction?

Secretary STEVENS. And I delegate it.

Senator McCLELLAN. When they make the decision, if they make a decision rejecting an application for a commission, is it then carried to you for your approval, for your review, or for any action whatsoever?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, tell us exactly what happened in the case of Schine? Who undertook to prosecute the request for a direct commission for him?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, General Reber was first contacted by Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, he was just a liaison man between the Hill over here, between the Congress and the Department?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. So he conveyed the message to someone?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. To whom?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, he filled out an application, and it was the Adjutant General's Office that processed it.

Senator McCLELLAN. The Adjutant General processed it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Schine went there to fill out the application?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. And he did fill it out there?

Secretary STEVENS. Finally he did; yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Finally he did. How many trips did he make down there to fill it out?

Secretary STEVENS. I think two.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you know why he didn't fill it out completely the first time?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, you took no action on it until he made the second trip and completed it?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Now, what action was taken on that application after he completed it, tell us what happened to it?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, it was referred to the technical service, in this case, the Transportation Corps.

Senator McCLELLAN. Who is the technical service now, who is at the head of it and who passed on the application?

Secretary STEVENS. General Yount was the head of it.

Senator McCLELLAN. General—

Secretary STEVENS. Yount, Y-o-u-n-t. He is Chief of Transportation.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is he the one that rejected the application?

Secretary STEVENS. He said that having looked over the application and seen what the qualifications were, and what the needs of his service were, that they had no place open for a commission for that particular qualification.

Senator McCLELLAN. Who did he give that report to?

Secretary STEVENS. Back to the Adjutant General, I would assume.

Senator McCLELLAN. He reported to the Adjutant General after examining the application that he wasn't qualified or that they had no place for an officer of his qualifications?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. Then what occurred? Did you pass on it at that time?

Secretary STEVENS. Then the Adjutant General would have notified General Reber, and he in turn would notify Mr. Schine.

Senator McCLELLAN. When it was taken up with you direct, either by Senator McCarthy, or by Mr. Schine, or Mr. Cohn, what did you do, if anything, to try to get him a direct commission? Did you take any action, any positive action to try to prosecute that application successfully?

Secretary STEVENS. No, the action was turned down by the Department of the Army. That was the end of it as far as we were concerned.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did you have the authority, if you had wanted to do it, as Secretary of the Army, to overrule the action that had been taken by your subordinates in turning down the application and grant him a commission?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say that I had the authority to do it, but I couldn't conceive of doing such a thing.

Senator McCLELLAN. You couldn't conceive of doing that?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. You have never done it for anyone else?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Therefore, you risked their judgment and relied upon their decision with respect to whether an applicant is qualified?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. So I want to ask you this question: State whether you did everything you and your subordinates, with respect to this application of Mr. Schine for a direct commission, that you would do and have done for all others who have so applied?

Secretary STEVENS. Everything.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do you spend as much time on every one of them as you have spent on this one?

Secretary STEVENS. I never had one that was in the same possible category as this one.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, what has placed this one in a different category to the others?

Secretary STEVENS. This constant and repeated contact in regard to Schine as represented by my summary of 65 telephone calls, 19 meetings, and so forth.

It was a question of accumulated effect of many, many individual actions, which totaled up to pressure that we were under.

Senator MUNDT. Sorry, the Senator's time has expired.

Senator McCLELLAN. I was just getting started.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dirksen, of Illinois.

I think the Senators will learn to appreciate the value of 10 minutes.

Senator McCLELLAN. I still favor unlimited debate, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Well, we will all have another turn at bat, approximately an hour and a half hence.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Secretary, I have just a few questions. First let us refer to the Fort Monmouth meeting at which time some members of the group who were there could not gain admission to the top-secret laboratory.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. What type of clearance is required to enter that laboratory?

Secretary STEVENS. That would be very top clearance.

Senator DIRKSEN. Is that what they call Q clearance?

Secretary STEVENS. No; that wouldn't be a Q clearance. Top secret.

Senator DIRKSEN. Top-secret clearance?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. Now, do Senators automatically have that clearance?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think they do, Senator Dirksen.

Senator DIRKSEN. But in any event, some distinction might be made between a Senator and a member of his staff?

Secretary STEVENS. That was my feeling, that anybody that had been elected to Congress was entitled to visit the laboratory.

Senator DIRKSEN. The party left Washington and went to Fort Monmouth, and I just assume that evidently the clearances were not provided for before they left Washington. Was that it?

Secretary STEVENS. We didn't know exactly what our plans for the day would be until we got there, Senator. As far as I know, no particular preliminary planning was done. The result was that when we came to that particular lab the question of proper clearance came up. We couldn't settle the whole business in a matter of 3 or 4 minutes, so I made my on-the-spot decision and unfortunately Mr. Cohn didn't like it.

Senator DIRKSEN. Where would clearance have to be obtained to enter that particular establishment?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say that clearance would have to be made by our Intelligence people.

Senator DIRKSEN. And made on an individual basis in each case?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. Somewhere it was not made for the staff; obviously they could not enter that particular structure.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. The only reason for the question is that the record indicates that you apologized about the matter, and I just wondered whether that fact entered into your apology, some frustration that having made the trip up there it was impossible for everyone to go into the laboratory.

Secretary STEVENS. That wasn't it. I dislike the use of the word "apology" even though I used it as Mr. Jenkins read it from the record. I have rethought about it and I feel that it was much more in the nature of an explanation than it was an apology. It wasn't anything to do with the fact that plans had gotten compli-

cated there or anything. I was sorry that Mr. Cohn or anyone else was distressed.

Senator DIRKSEN. You testified a little while ago that General Partridge was shifted from his position as Chief of G-2. There were also other changes in the staff?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. But you didn't particularize and say how many.

Secretary STEVENS. For example, the Vice Chief of Staff, and the Chief of Information, to mention two that I can think of offhand.

There have been a lot of other changes, too, which I can particularize for you if you would like to have them, Senator.

Senator DIRKSEN. It is not material except to indicate whether this stood by itself—

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, no.

Senator DIRKSEN. Or whether there were a number of changes.

Secretary STEVENS. There were a number of changes made. It is routine procedure with an incoming new Chief of Staff to so staff his organization that he has the people that he wants to handle that tremendous job in the way that he thinks it should be handled.

Senator DIRKSEN. Going back for a moment to the application of Mr. Schine for a commission, did you examine the written application and are you familiar with what is in it?

Secretary STEVENS. No; I am not personally familiar with that written application.

Senator DIRKSEN. There has been very little testimony thus far with respect to qualifications, but if you are not familiar with the application itself, what the principal recitals are, namely, the facts that would have to be the foundation for consideration for a commission or for intelligence duty, I presume that question ought to be directed to some other person. So if you have no firsthand familiarity with the application, I shall not press it.

Secretary STEVENS. No. I haven't studied the application personally.

Senator DIRKSEN. That is all for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Secretary, what gave rise to the release of the so-called chronology of events which I think was released on March 11?

Secretary STEVENS. What gave rise to it?

Senator JACKSON. Yes.

Secretary STEVENS. I would say, Senator Jackson, that it was an increasing interest on the part of the Senators and Congressman on this Hill that gave rise to it.

Senator JACKSON. At what time did you reach the so-called breaking point in your relations with the chairman of the committee and the staff? I have listened very carefully to all of the events, meetings, telephone calls, and so on, that occurred over a period of time dating back to your return from Montana, and until after your return from the Far East. About what time did you decide to put down on paper what was going on and to do something about it?

Secretary STEVENS. This chronology that you referred to was prepared, I would say, during the first week or 10 days of March.

Senator JACKSON. What I am trying to get at, what was the breaking point? You had all these meetings and conversations which later

resulted in serious charges. What happened, what took place, that made it necessary for you or someone under your direction to send the chronology of events and charges?

Secretary STEVENS. I am afraid I have been slow in getting your question.

Senator JACKSON. Maybe my question was not very clear. I am sitting over at this side of the table trying to find out just what went on.

Secretary STEVENS. What had happened was that the question of Schine's training at Fort Dix had become a matter of some interest to the Congress of the United States. We had received a fair number of letters in regard to the matter, extending over a period of several weeks. We acknowledged those letters and said we were looking into the matter and would supply information later on.

Time went by, and more inquiries came in, and it finally got to the point where this information had to be made available to this committee and to other Members of the Congress who had inquired about it.

Senator JACKSON. At what point in this chronology of events did you come to the conclusion that the requests and demands made of you were improper and had gone beyond the point of propriety? Do you have any idea?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say that that information started to accumulate back during the early period of training of Schine at Dix, and it built up increasingly as time went on.

Senator JACKSON. You had reservations from the very beginning that it was a cumulative sort of thing?

Secretary STEVENS. I won't say that I had reservations, but it began to be apparent that Mr. Schine, Private Schine, was something of a problem to the commanding officer at Fort Dix, and this began to become public property over a period of time, and Members of the Congress got interested in it.

Senator JACKSON. Word was being rumored around that requests of an unusual nature were being made in behalf of Mr. Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, that was rumored around.

Senator JACKSON. Who prepared this chronology of events? Do I understand that it was a Mr. Brown in Mr. Hensel's office?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator JACKSON. According to the statement appearing in U. S. News & World Report of March 12, 1954, in which your charges and the charges of Senator McCarthy and the staff were printed, it was stated that:

It is not a report. It is John Adams' version of the situation—
This is coming from, I believe, Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn and Mr. Carr. This is a direct quote:

It is not a report. It is John Adams' version of the situation. There has been issued a twisted, distorted, untrue version written by a man who has a special interest in the situation.

Secretary STEVENS. Of course, I think that is a completely inaccurate and, in itself, unfair statement.

Senator JACKSON. That statement is not true?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator JACKSON. Could you tell the committee—as I understand it, Mr. Brown in Mr. Hensel's office prepared this?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator JACKSON. Why was it sent to the Department of Defense?

Secretary STEVENS. You see, Senator Potter wrote the Secretary of Defense a letter on this subject, dated, I think it was the 8th of March, and he put down some very pointed questions. The Secretary of Defense wanted to be in a position to answer Senator Potter's letter. The chronology—

Senator JACKSON. Normally—Mr. Secretary, I do not mean to break in, but normally wouldn't you send the material, that is, prepare it in your office and send it to the Secretary of Defense for his reply? That is what confused me.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's time has expired, but you may answer the question.

Secretary STEVENS. Could I have it read, Senator?

Senator JACKSON. I will state it again very briefly:

Normally when a letter is sent to the Secretary of Defense, a letter of inquiry, relating to the Army, wouldn't the Army normally prepare that information and forward it to the Secretary and let the Secretary send the reply covering the information sent by the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, that frequently happens, Senator. That is normal procedure.

Senator JACKSON. In this case, however, it was not done?

Secretary STEVENS. John Adams is the Department Counselor, and I think that had a bearing of why it went up to the Department of Defense.

Senator JACKSON. I understand I had only 6 minutes.

Senator MUNDT. I beg your pardon. I was told the time was up. The timekeeper was in error. You have 4 minutes more.

Senator JACKSON. I understand I have 4 minutes in which to expire.

Mr. Stevens, can you tell us about this agreement whereby the Army granted passes at Fort Dix to Private Schine? Now, let me just continue that by stating that according to the Army report:

On December 6, 1953, General Ryan telephoned Mr. Adams from Fort Dix and stated the matter of handling Private Schine was becoming increasingly difficult since the soldier was leaving the post nearly every night.

Now, on page 11 of your statement of Friday, I mean of your statement of charges, you are quoted as saying that you had told General Ryan that Schine should be made available upon the request of the committee staff over week ends when required to complete Schine's work for the committee and provided that it did not interfere with his training.

Then the statement of charges submitted by Senator McCarthy's in paragraph 13 of the charges state that, and I quote:

to call participation in arrangements to have Private Schine devote many hours over and above Army training which could otherwise have been spent in recreation, to the completion of vital committee work, a request for preferential treatment defies reason. All such arrangements were made with the full concurrence of Mr. Stevens.

Now, can you just tell the committee about this arrangement or whatever it was at Fort Dix? First, was it understood that Private Schine could leave the fort at night after the completion of his training or was it just week ends, or was it any time the committee requested his release for committee work?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator Jackson, it was at any time that the committee actually needed him for work, providing it didn't interfere with his training and also providing that it was under General Ryan's jurisdiction to make a determination on whether or not it complied with those provisions.

Senator JACKSON. But you see on your statement of charges, I believe on page 11, you stated that you told General Ryan that he should be made available upon the request of the committee staff over weekends.

Now, what was the operating arrangement at Fort Dix? I realize that it may not have been a written document, but what sort of an understanding was the general operating under? I take it that General Ryan found it a bit difficult to carry out his directives.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right. The original arrangement, you will recall, Senator Jackson, was temporary duty to New York.

Senator MUNDT. I am sorry, this time it is official and your time is up.

Secretary STEVENS. I hadn't finished my answer.

Then, that was changed to being available for committee work, from Fort Dix when actually needed by the committee and providing it didn't interfere with his training. At first that was believed to be needed on an evening during the course of a week, would he be made in the nature of weekends, but when the question came up that if he was available providing it was legitimate committee business and did not interfere with his training, that also was permitted subject to General Ryan's view of the individual situation.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the Chair that I have something which I consider of extreme importance in regard to this investigation and if my turn comes up when I am absent, Mr. Cohn will take it.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you.

May the Chair ask the timekeeper not to take from Senator Potter's time the answer of Secretary Stevens, and we will charge that time to Mr. Jenkins because he has time to spare, and nobody else has.

Senator POTTER. I think it generous action of the chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I have to preface my question. I would like to state this, that I am neither a counsel for any of the parties nor am I a devil's advocate in this controversy.

I would like to ask this one question: Is it not a fact that there was an original chronological outline of the order of events that was prepared in your office, or in the Department of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say there was a file of papers, Senator Potter, containing a lot of material, which was subsequently put together into this chronology, and everything that was in that file is available to this committee.

Senator POTTER. Is it not a fact that certain statements which now appear in your statement of specifications were made available to the press, or were printed in the press, several weeks prior to the time that the Members of Congress received the chronological outline of the order of events which you have submitted?

Secretary STEVENS. That may be so, Senator Potter, but if so I don't know how it was done.

Senator POTTER. You have no knowledge as to whether that so-called leak came from the Army or from other sources?

Secretary STEVENS. All I can say is that I can only speak for myself, and I assure you that it did not come from me.

Senator POTTER. Have you heard that a leak had occurred in the Department of the Army concerning this chronological order of events before Members of the Congress received the report?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, you mean the chronology of events as finally submitted to the committee?

Senator POTTER. Not as finally submitted, but in its original form.

Secretary STEVENS. Will you repeat that question for me, Senator, or can it be read by the reporter?

Senator POTTER. The question is whether you had any personal knowledge as to whether members of your staff had leaked this information to the press prior to the time that the Members of Congress received the chronological order of events in its final form; I am speaking now of the information contained in its original form or as you cite in the files.

Secretary STEVENS. I know, of course, that there was original form, as you call it, Senator, and I have heard that there were newspaper people who were aware of what was in that. But I personally didn't have a copy of it, and I certainly had nothing to do with any leak in connection with it. I did hear rumors that it had leaked.

Senator POTTER. Did you question any of your staff as to whether they had leaked this information to the press?

Secretary STEVENS. I didn't personally question them, no; but evidently from what you said it did leak. Who saw it and when, I don't know.

Senator POTTER. I am sure you are familiar with the fact that it was more or less an open secret for a month that the Army had in its possession this report, and the fragmentary information that came to my attention—and, I assume, to the attention of other Members of Congress—was the basis for my request that, if the Army had this information, the committee certainly should receive it and take whatever action was necessary.

Secretary STEVENS. Sure, I certainly agree with that, Senator. I know a number of people who saw the report that you are referring to. Evidently, from what you say, some newspaper people saw it. I would be surprised if any of them had a copy of it.

Senator POTTER. When did it come to your knowledge that the Department of the Army was keeping a chronological report of this controversy?

Secretary STEVENS. It came to my knowledge after my return from the Far East on the 3d of February.

Senator POTTER. You had no knowledge of it prior to that time?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator POTTER. If I may switch to another subject, during the cross-examination this morning there was much discussion concerning the number of persons let out at Fort Monmouth because they were security risks.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator POTTER. How many of the men who were suspended as security risks were suspended without the Army having any prior knowledge that they were security risks until Senator McCarthy's committee started this investigation?

Secretary STEVENS. Not a single one, as far as I can recall.

Senator POTTER. In other words, it is your testimony that the Army had a report, and they were investigating all the persons that were later separated as security risks.

Secretary STEVENS. As far as I know, that is correct; all of them.

Senator POTTER. I would like to revert to your statement which had some interest to me. I would like to ask this one question on your report of chronological events: How many other Members of Congress requested this report?

Secretary STEVENS. I think that there was something like 8 or 10, Senator.

Senator POTTER. Eight or 10 Members of Congress?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Senator POTTER. I think as long as my name has been brought into this question of asking for the report, I should state this: When I received the report, the only persons who saw it, other than myself, were Senator McCarthy, Senator Dirksen, and Senator Mundt. So the publication of this report did not come from my office.

Mr. Stevens, I was interested in your statement in which I believe you made four points of the efforts made in behalf of the committee staff to secure preferential treatment for Mr. Schine. I note that efforts were made to release Mr. Schine from KP duty. Would you elaborate on that, because it happened that in my first 24 hours in the Army I served 17 hours on KP, and I have a little personal interest in how that could be done.

Secretary STEVENS. Senator Potter, I can't give you the detail on that because I just don't have it. General Ryan, however, is available, and will testify if you wish him to, with respect to all the details of this matter. I personally have not been able to follow all the day-by-day activities of Private Schine or other privates in every camp that we have in the United States Army. We have some other problems we have to deal with too. General Ryan would be glad to give you the detail on that.

Senator POTTER. Do you know whether Private Schine was relieved from KP duty or not?

Secretary STEVENS. It is my impression that he was relieved, but I am not sure of that. I would rather have General Ryan testify on it.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Symington is recognized for 10 minutes.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Secretary, I have just a few questions here.

As I understand it, you testified that the draft boards, the records and the organization itself, are not under the Army, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. At a point you mentioned that the Army at Fort Monmouth is working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with espionage at Fort Monmouth. I do not want to take my 10 minutes in having you explain that to me, but I would appreciate your making up for the record some details with respect to that situation which you feel the public could know about. In other words, what was the nature of the relationship, how were they working with the Army at Fort Monmouth. Will you do that, please, for the report?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes. Senator Symington, may I coordinate that with Mr. Hoover of the FBI in doing it?

Senator SYMINGTON. Of course.

I would like to ask this question: Are you the head of the Army, or is General Ridgway?

Secretary STEVENS. I am the head of the Army.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you believe in civilian control of the military services?

Secretary STEVENS. I do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Do you consider that it is the function of the Secretary to have the Department put in the best possible, most proper position with the Congress and the people?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, I do.

Senator SYMINGTON. Would you consider it proper to do your best to have the Army, which you head, and yourself be in the best possible position with this committee?

Secretary STEVENS. I am not sure I follow that, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. I will repeat it. Would you consider it proper to do your best to have the Army, which you head, and yourself, to in turn be in the best possible position it can be with this committee?

Secretary STEVENS. I want to do the best I can along that line, sir, with this committee and the other committees.

Senator SYMINGTON. Was your interest in stopping the committee's investigation at Fort Monmouth, or stopping the publicity, or both, or what?

Secretary STEVENS. I did not want to stop the investigation. I wanted to change the nature of the hearing, or at least to have the publicity that was given out come nearer to reflecting the actual facts than was the case at Fort Monmouth.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Secretary, if a committee of the Congress with proper authority expresses interest in any particular situation, does not that mean that that particular situation is automatically expedited in the Army itself?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. The next question I would like to ask, Mr. Secretary: As I understand it, you did not prepare these charges, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you had prepared them—as I remember it, they were signed by your counsel, Mr. Welch—

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator SYMINGTON. If you had prepared them following the questioning of the Chairman, would you have left the name of Mr. Carr out?

Secretary STEVENS. Would I have left the name of Mr. Carr out?

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes, as one of the three principals.

Secretary STEVENS. No, I don't think so.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to say in Mr. Carr's interest, Mr. Secretary, that I wasn't very happy about your replies to those questions, personally. I do not know whether it is in order to say that.

Now I would like to ask this question: I believe you said that Mr. Schine was assigned to New York before November 10 and then the counsel said something about Mr. Schine not being in the Army until November 10. Clear that up for me, will you?

Secretary STEVENS. The original plan was to put him on temporary duty with the First Army in New York on the day he was inducted, which was November 3. Shortly thereafter, Senator McCarthy indi-

cated that he would like to have that temporary duty in New York canceled, and thereafter Mr. Cohn indicated that as long as the week had moved along a certain length of time, he thought that Schine should stay off over the weekend in order to do committee work, and that was done.

Senator SYMINGTON. I did not mean to interrupt you. Had you finished?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to ask the question another way, then: At the time you had the lunch in the Pentagon, was Mr. Schine in the Army or was he not?

Secretary STEVENS. He was.

Senator SYMINGTON. My final question, Mr. Secretary: Whatever the agreement was with respect to Mr. Schine, why was it made and how was it violated? In other words, if it was agreed that Mr. Schine should be off every night, then why is there any complaint when he did get off? If it is not agreed that he should get off, then why did General Ryan have to telephone to get permission to get him off? There seems to be some difference there.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, the agreement was that Mr. Schine was to be available for committee business, and frankly there seemed to be a lot of committee business.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I don't wish to pursue it, but if an agreement was that he could be off for committee business, and the statements made were that he was going to be off for committee business, then why is it violation of an agreement?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, perhaps there may be involved a question of what is committee business.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, who decided that is wasn't committee business?

Secretary STEVENS. Who decided that it wasn't?

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, there was a further provision that it could not interfere with his training, Senator, and so, of course, with that provision General Ryan had that.

Senator SYMINGTON. That was part of the agreement?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator SYMINGTON. And the decision was made that the number of times he was asked to get off for committee business did interfere with his training?

Secretary STEVENS. If it did, then he was not supposed to get off.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, did it, in your opinion, or General Ryan's opinion?

Secretary STEVENS. Interfere with his training?

I would rather have General Ryan testify on that because he actually knows.

Senator SYMINGTON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dworshak.

Senator DWORSHAK. I have no question.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch, you now have 10 minutes and 3 microphones.

Mr. WELCH. At this moment, I want to ask only one question, which I unhappily dealt with in the form of a statement of my own. Is it

a fact, Mr. Stevens, that the specifications that were drawn and signed by me as your counsel, were drawn without your active participation?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct, on short notice.

Mr. WELCH. And did you learn that Mr. St. Clair and I worked overtime and a way after dark on the night that they were prepared?

Secretary STEVENS. I did.

Mr. WELCH. That is all at the moment.

Senator MUNDT. Now, Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Stevens, there is one matter that concerns me very deeply here, and that is the matter of Frank Carr. I was one of those who, I might tell you, attempted to persuade him to give up one of the top jobs in the Federal Bureau of Investigation to come with our committee, and now in the specifications filed by the Army there is a charge that improper means were used to get preferential treatment for Mr. Schine by Mr. Frank Carr on October 2, 1953, in that Mr. Carr on that date, and I quote:

Sought to induce or persuade the Secretary of the Army to give Schine some kind of special assignment and some kind of special treatment.

Now, is that charge made by you true or is it false? I think in justice to Mr. Carr that should be acknowledged at this time.

Secretary STEVENS. I just want to check the reading.

Well, Mr. Cohn, it is like I said before, in my mind, that Mr. Carr was not nearly as active in that conversation as you were, but he was there, and in my opinion took a lesser part in it.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Stevens, will you tell Senator Mundt, please, sir, and the committee any one word that was spoken by Frank Carr about Dave Schine on that day?

Secretary STEVENS. I can't recall the exact words.

Mr. COHN. Do you recall that any words were spoken by him about Dave Schine on that date?

Secretary STEVENS. I recall that he, in a minor way, backed you up in connection with the statements you were making.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Stevens, is it not a fact that in the series of events, this 34-page report released by the Army, under date of March 11, 1953, in giving a detailed recital of what took place on October 2, you specifically said that all of the talking about Dave Schine had been done by me and you did not even mention Mr. Carr's name?

Secretary STEVENS. I said that Mr. Carr played a minor part.

Mr. COHN. Sir, I am trying to ask now whether Mr. Carr played any part, and if he did, I would like you to tell the committee just what part he did play.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair believes in fairness to all of the questioners, and it is perfectly proper that the witness have time to consult notes and counsel; that those consultations the timekeeper should take out of the 10 minutes so that nobody is deprived.

Mr. COHN. Thank you very much.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman—

Senator MUNDT. He is about to answer a question.

Senator MCCARTHY. While Mr. Stevens is consulting his notes may I explain to the Chair that I was absent for a number of minutes here because I was interviewing a witness whom I think will have information of tremendous importance to this committee, and I am seeing him again tonight, and I will give the Chair a report tomorrow morning.

Senator MUNDT. That statement will have to come out of Mr. Cohn's ten minutes, but that is all right.

Mr. Stevens.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, my recollection remains as I have indicated; namely, that Mr. Carr took a minor part in this particular discussion.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Stevens, in the Army events, and I want to start with this first; you are the only possible witness on your side as to this particular conversation, are you not, and the only three people who were present were yourself, Mr. Carr, and myself; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. So that there—by the way, do you have a monitoring machine installed in your office to take down what is said?

Secretary STEVENS. I do not.

Mr. COHN. I see. So that the only three people there were yourself, myself, and Mr. Carr; is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. So that if there were any improper conduct by Mr. Carr, and if he had used any improper means to get preferential treatment for Private Schine or anyone else, you would be the only one in position to know that other than us; is that right? What I mean to say is you would be the only source of information for Mr. Welch, and the other people drawing up this account of what happened in your office on October 2, when only three people in the world, Secretary Stevens, Cohn, and Carr were present?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. I would now ask you, sir, whether or not it is a fact that when you gave a full account of what happened on that day in the Army event number 6, dated October 2, 1953, you specifically said that the discussion about Schine was stated by Mr. Cohn, and that there is no mention whatsoever of Mr. Frank Carr having participated in that conversation?

Secretary STEVENS. Certainly, that is true; but that doesn't mean that Mr. Carr didn't participate in the conversation.

Mr. COHN. Are you now saying he did, sir?

Secretary STEVENS. In my opinion, he did, that is my recollection.

Mr. COHN. Would you tell the committee what he said, please?

Secretary STEVENS. I cannot tell you. I said you did most of the talking, and Carr backed you up in what I have referred to as a minor or lesser way.

Mr. COHN. Can you remember one word that Mr. Carr said on the subject of Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. I say in a very minor way.

Senator McCARTHY. May I interrupt, Mr. Cohn?

Secretary Stevens, I have been trying to follow your answers, both to Senator Mundt and to other Senators, and Mr. Cohn, when asked you about this, and you say that Carr backed up Mr. Cohn.

Do I understand that you mean he backed him up by silence or backed him up by conversation, and if he backed him up by conversation, then let us have the conversation.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, first of all, he did nothing to stop the conversation.

Senator McCARTHY. All right, now we have silence. From there let us go on.

Secretary STEVENS. And secondly, Mr. Cohn did most of the talking, as the chronology indicates but Mr. Carr, in my recollection, also in a lesser way, a far lesser way, brought up the same thing.

Senator McCARTHY. Look, Bob, you are accusing Frank Carr of something very serious.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. You say that he tried to improperly influence you. Now, if he said something that was improper, we should know what he said. If he didn't say anything improper, and if you can't remember anything improper, then you should tell us. Let me say this: I think that you are trying to give us an honest account.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. Some of my friends don't agree with that, I may say.

Mr. COHN. I am not one of those, Senator.

Senator McCARTHY. I think it is only fair to ask of you to tell us what Frank Carr did that was improper.

Secretary STEVENS. Well—

Senator McCARTHY. What you are doing here, Bob, you are asking a young man to be discharged from his job because of improper conduct. And you can't tell us what it is.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Senator, the Department of the Army has put in this bill of particulars, and I think that there will be other material that will come before the committee that will bear on this.

Senator McCARTHY. Just a moment. If Mr. Cohn will yield for a moment, you say the Army put in this bill of particulars. No. 1, may I have it, the Army did not put in the bill of particulars. You and Mr. Adams put in the bill of particulars, and we are talking about one specification on or about October 2. That is a conversation between you, Mr. Carr, and Mr. Cohn, and here is what your bill of particulars says. It says:

On or about October 2, 1953, Mr. Cohn and Mr. Francis Carr, executive director of the subcommittee, while discussing detailed plans for the conduct of investigation by the subcommittee at Fort Monmouth, N. J., sought to induce or persuade the Secretary of the Army to arrange for the assignment of Mr. Schine to a post in the New York City area, upon his induction into the Army, on the ground that it was considered desirable by Mr. Cohn to have Mr. Schine available for consultation with the staff of the subcommittee to complete certain work which was alleged Mr. Schine was familiar.

Now, the only witness other than Mr. Carr and Mr. Cohn who can testify to that is yourself.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. This specification must be based upon your statement, I assume, to your counsel?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. Now, just for your own benefit, and I am not trying to entrap you at all, I think the Secretary will agree with me on that, on page 226, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Jenkins asked this question:

Did Mr. Carr make any statement whatever insofar as your recollection enables you to answer that question?

Secretary STEVENS. Do you mean with respect to David Schine?

Mr. JENKINS. Did Mr. Carr make any statement at that conference, and did he intercede for Schine?

Answer—this was only last Friday, Bob—

I do not recollect that he did, I think the conversation on Schine was entirely—
was entirely—
with Mr. Cohn.

Now, I think you should tell us today whether you are changing that testimony, and if so why, and why since Friday only a matter of a limited number of hours you suddenly want to implicate Frank Carr in this.

Has something occurred to make you change your mind?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Senator, of course as I ponder over these events and attempt to probe my memory and get the facts before the committee—

Senator McCARTHY. Could I ask the young man to move to one side so I can see the witness, or if he can get down a little lower. Will you do that?

Senator MUNDT. Go ahead.

Secretary STEVENS. As I say, Senator, when one is probing a memory, as hard as I am probing mine, in order to get all of the facts before this committee, you do sharpen up things as you go along. I didn't in that direct examination, I couldn't recollect any specific thing that Frank Carr had said on this particular date, and I cannot recollect the specific thing now.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, can I interrupt you, here is a most serious charge made against my chief of staff, a young man with a record of 10 years with the FBI, head of their subversive squad. And you make this charge, and you say that Frank Carr improperly tried to influence you. You do that in your specifications 1 day.

Senator MUNDT. Senator, your time is finished.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to finish the question so when it comes around he can answer. You make the charge 1 day that Frank Carr did something improper and then you appear, under oath, and you say he said nothing. And then 3 days later you say yes, maybe he said something, and maybe he didn't, and you don't know, and you think he did, and maybe it was his silence.

Now, I won't have a chance to ask you questions again for about 90 minutes. In the meantime, I wish you would have your counsel or someone ponder that question and try it and give me an answer to it.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, I will ask you this question by way of further cross-examination: Did Senator McCarthy ever at any time threaten you in case you did not do things for Schine?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did he ever use any vituperative language?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did Mr. Cohn ever at any time make any threats against you if you did not do the things for Schine that he asked you to do?

Secretary STEVENS. According to my information, to which I have testified, he made some threats against the Army.

Mr. JENKINS. But did he personally ever make any threats to you?

Secretary STEVENS. Personally to me? No.

Mr. JENKINS. I take it that you mean the threat or alleged threat at Fort Monmouth on October 20? Are those the threats to which you refer?

Secretary STEVENS. That is part of them; yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. A declaration of war?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And a further complete investigation of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you ever communicate those threats to his boss, his superior, Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. I think Senator McCarthy knew all about them, I would think.

Mr. JENKINS. I didn't ask you that. Did you ever yourself convey those threats to Senator McCarthy?

Secretary STEVENS. I did not personally, but Senator McCarthy was right there on the occasion at Fort Monmouth when this all happened.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe that Senator McCarthy was in the laboratory with you, was he not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. When this alleged explosion took place?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. You did not tell Senator McCarthy what you understood Mr. Cohn had said on that day?

Secretary STEVENS. I didn't personally tell him, no.

Mr. JENKINS. The Secretary of Defense is your immediate superior, is he not?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you convey those threats to him or inform him that such threats had been made, Secretary Wilson?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't think that I did, probably.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you convey them to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. To——

Mr. JENKINS. To the President?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you convey that information to anyone?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, yes, sir, people within my own organization who knew about it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, you have told about tendering your plane to Senator McCarthy and the members of his staff to go to Boston, is that right?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. What was the date of that?

Secretary STEVENS. That was on the 17th of November.

Mr. JENKINS. How did you return to Washington?

Secretary STEVENS. The Maguire Air Force Base there was kind enough to send me down on a small plane they had there.

Mr. JENKINS. You tendered the services of your regular plane to the Senator and his staff to use in being conveyed to Boston on that occasion?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't have a regular plane.

Mr. JENKINS. The plane that you initially went up in?

Secretary STEVENS. This is a United States Air Force plane that comes out of what they call the pool.

Mr. JENKINS. What was the purpose of that, Mr. Secretary, if it wasn't to court favor with this committee?

Secretary STEVENS. The purpose of it was to cooperate and make it possible for Senator McCarthy and his staff to get to Boston at some reasonable hour. They had committee business there the next morning.

Mr. JENKINS. That was on November 17?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. After these threats had been made by Mr. Cohn, you say?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. And after all of this controversy had been going on between you and the committee for weeks and weeks?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. In your specifications No. 8, which were filed, as I recall, on the 13th of this month, it is stated thusly, and I ask you to refer to specifications No. 8 in your bill of particulars:

These requests were coupled with promises to limit or terminate hearings of committee on Fort Monmouth—

Secretary STEVENS. Wait until I catch this. What is the number, sir?

Mr. JENKINS. No. 8. Will you now read to the committee your specification No. 8 filed against the McCarthy investigating committee?

Secretary STEVENS. "On or about November 6", sir? Is that the one you mean?

Mr. JENKINS. Specification No. 8, if you will read that.

Senator MUNDT. Of your presentation dated April 13. Perhaps you are looking at the wrong memorandum.

Mr. JENKINS. Not the events, but the specifications.

Secretary STEVENS (reading):

On or about November 6, 1953, Senator McCarthy, Mr. Cohn, and Mr. Carr sought to induce and persuade Secretary Stevens and Mr. Adams to arrange for the assignment of Private Schine to New York City to study and report evidence, if any, of pro-Communist leanings in West Point textbooks. Mr. Cohn, in the presence of and with the consent of Senator McCarthy and Mr. Carr, sought to induce and persuade Secretary Stevens and Mr. Adams to arrange to make Private Schine available for subcommittee work while he was undergoing basic training at Fort Dix, N. J. These requests were coupled with promises reasonably to limit or to terminate subcommittee hearings on Fort Monmouth.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, that was the consideration they offered you. In their request of you to assign Schine to the New York area, the inducement or consideration offered you on that occasion, according to you, was to limit or terminate hearings of the committee on Fort Monmouth, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I wouldn't say that was correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Is that not what is stated there, that they offer you a consideration with promises to limit or terminate the hearings of the committee on Fort Monmouth? Is that not what you have said in that specification?

Secretary STEVENS. I have been talking about the hearings, Mr. Jenkins, not the investigation. I have tried to make it clear—

Mr. JENKINS. To limit or terminate the hearings of the committee on Fort Monmouth. That is the consideration offered you, is it not, Mr. Stevens, according to you?

Secretary STEVENS. It is the hearings that I have been complaining about, not the investigation.

Mr. JENKINS. Does not that indicate that you wanted these hearings—isn't it further evidence that you wanted these hearings terminated?

Secretary STEVENS. I have testified that I wanted the hearings gotten under control so they would not have the very bad effect that they were having, both in the public mind and on the Army.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe you further testified that you wanted the hearings as well as the investigation suspended.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You have not thus testified today?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, not the investigation, sir. The investigation, I said, should continue on, and I would make progress reports from time to time.

Mr. JENKINS. Then you deny that that statement in your specification No. 8 indicates that you wanted the hearings limited or terminated? You deny that?

Secretary STEVENS. I said that—I think I used the language that I thought that the Fort Monmouth hearings had served their purpose. In other words, they pointed the thing up, they focused the Army's attention on this matter. We were getting into it. We wanted the investigation to carry on, but to let us handle the thing unless and until we demonstrated that we couldn't handle it and clean this situation up.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you know why Senator McCarthy or his staff would have said to you, "Now you assign Schine to the New York area or let him study the context of the West Point textbooks, and if you will do that we will limit or terminate the hearings of our committee on Fort Monmouth"? Do you know why they would have held out such a consideration to you if you had not previously asked for it?

Secretary STEVENS. As I said—I seem to have difficulty, Mr. Jenkins, in trying to make this point clear—at the meeting in New York on the 14th, at the luncheon, I got the impression that Senator McCarthy and his committee were about ready to turn this investigation, the prosecution of this investigation, over to the Army. We are now talking about the 6th of November. My thought was if they had anything in mind along about the 14th of October of turning the investigation over to the Army, certainly by the 6th of November that would be true.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Secretary, I dislike to revert to this discussion about Frank Carr, but I think that I should temporarily do so, in justice to Mr. Carr; because part of the reason for asking for specifications on both sides of this was so that this committee could know specifically what it was that was being charged against each one of the principals, so that the principal could in turn respond and reply to the charges.

When we had General Smith and General Reber here, I think they both testified in your presence that they did not consider it improper for Members of Congress or individual citizens or friends or relatives

of inductees to request consideration for a commission provided that they felt that they had the qualifications for a commission.

Do you share that reaction as expressed by Generals Reber and Smith?

Secretary STEVENS. I think it is perfectly all right for it to be asked for, one time.

Senator MUNDT. So that merely being present at a meeting where such a commission was being solicited would not, I take it, in your opinion, comprise on the part of Mr. Carr the utilization of improper means?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, Senator, I am trying my best. And one thing I don't want to do is I don't want to be unfair to Mr. Carr or anyone else.

Senator MUNDT. I am sure that that is correct.

Secretary STEVENS. I want to have it exactly, the truth out just exactly as it was. I cannot recall specific language by Mr. Carr. I therefore have to go on my recollection of the meeting in which the conversation with respect to Mr. Schine was definitely led by Mr. Cohn, and in my opinion Mr. Carr in a much lesser way was interested in the same thing.

Senator MUNDT. You keep using the phrase, I believe, that Mr. Carr played a minor part.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Now, I ask you, sir, if we leave it as ambiguous as that, just how are we going to find out from Mr. Carr, when he is a witness, whether or not he played that minor part which you seem unable to define.

Don't you think in justice to him that you should search your memory to the point where you discover what minor part he played or else insofar as your testimony is concerned state that you are not endeavoring to implicate him as being guilty of improper methods?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with that completely. I think that I certainly should search my memory to the very limit of my ability and I can assure you that that is what I am trying to do. I dislike to the nth degree to say or do anything that would be unfair to anybody like Mr. Carr.

Senator MUNDT. Thank you. Because it is almost impossible for this committee to interrogate him about the charges until they are defined; you appreciate that.

Very well. I am not sure, Mr. Secretary, that this question should be directed to you, and if it should not you may tell me to whom it should be directed. But in your statement on page 152 which you read on Friday, you said that Schine had obtained 15 passes from the post, and that the majority of new personnel received only 3 passes. Are you in position to tell us why those 15 passes were procured, and what for, and in response to what pressure, and what he did at the time he took those passes?

Secretary STEVENS. I am not personally. But we have witnesses that will be available.

Senator MUNDT. Will you name the witness to whom I should direct those questions?

Secretary STEVENS. I would say General Rielly and——

Senator MUNDT. General Rielly and——

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Senator MUNDT. I want to read you now the telegram that you included in your testimony, dated March 12, and it is the telegram which you stated you received from Senator McCarthy. That is on page 161 of the transcript.

In view of news stories this morning, re Cohn and Schine, would appreciate if you would make it clear to the press that the only time you and I ever discussed the subject of a commission for David Schine was in his presence, at which time I urged and you fully agreed that his case had to be treated the same as the case of any other draftee, and that we agreed that any other handling of the case in view of the investigation of the Army, would be extremely bad for the committee and the Army, and that David Schine was present and fully agreed with us in the matter.

Your only comment in your statement was that the "important thing to note is that he admits having taken up with me the matter of a commission for Schine." The Chair agrees that that is important, and he thinks it is also important to know whether or not the statements contained in that telegram were correct or incorrect.

Secretary STEVENS. I think that they are incorrect, in the latter part of the telegram.

Senator MUNDT. Will you point out where the inaccuracies or the inadequacies were?

Secretary STEVENS. Because I don't think Senator McCarthy—I have no recollection of Senator McCarthy, and I would have had a recollection of it, stating that all of this business, it could all be handled just like everybody else. That part of the telegram is not in accordance—

Senator MUNDT. To the best of your recollection, he never made any such statement?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator MUNDT. Otherwise the telegram is correct? That is the statements in the telegram?

Secretary STEVENS. I have, I believe, testified to the fact that Senator McCarthy on at least one occasion, took this up. He states here "that the only time," and I am not prepared definitely—

Senator MUNDT. It would not make any difference in the chairman's mind from "the only time" or "at least once."

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I mean—

Senator MUNDT. Unless you are sure there was a second time.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes.

Senator MUNDT. Are you sure there is a second time?

Secretary STEVENS. I am not testifying to that effect now, sir, no.

Senator MUNDT. To the best of your present recollection, the statement in the telegram is correct, except the parts to which you have already drawn our attention?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, including that reference to "only took it up one time." I am not subscribing to that at this time?

Senator MUNDT. Are you denying that at this time?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator MUNDT. You are just saying you are not sure?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator MUNDT. There has been a lot of testimony about Fort Monmouth, and the fact that some of the personnel employed in the defense establishments may have been guilty of subversive conduct. May I ask, are some or most of the secret devices which are developed

in the laboratories at Fort Monmouth ultimately processed or fabricated by private defense establishments?

Secretary STEVENS. A lot of it is; yes, most of it.

Senator MUNDT. So that if unhappily there are subversive elements in private defense establishments working on the processes developed at Fort Monmouth, that would be placing the security of our country in jeopardy, would it not?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right, and that is the point that came up at the luncheon on November 6, when I said this was a problem for the whole Defense Establishment.

Senator MUNDT. One other question. On page 245, we have had a lot of discussion about the apology or explanation or whatever word most appropriately fits your conversation in which you said you tried to calm down Mr. Cohn. You have said nothing up to now as to what Mr. Cohn might have said in response. Did your explanation placate him, or was he as irritated as ever after you concluded?

Secretary STEVENS. From where I sat, I couldn't hear that he said anything, and if he did it was not within my hearing.

Senator MUNDT. This explanation must have been made to him in his hearing?

Secretary STEVENS. Oh, yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. You directed your remarks to him?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator MUNDT. And as far as you can recall, he did not say anything?

Secretary STEVENS. I didn't hear him say anything.

Senator MUNDT. Could you tell by looking at him whether he seemed placated or whether his irritation was there?

Secretary STEVENS. I think maybe it helped a little, but I think Mr. Cohn was still very provoked.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. To get this back in proper perspective, I have listened to this testimony and, according to my recollection of it there are some eight specific requests and different requests, requests of a different nature, for preferred treatment for Mr. Schine. I want to ask you about these. I will try to ask you in their chronological order as I remember the testimony, and I will ask you to answer and state whether they are true.

The first request that came to you was for a direct commission in the Army; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. The second request was for a direct commission in one of the other branches of the service; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That was another occasion. I am trying to think of the chronology of it, Senator.

Senator McCLELLAN. Maybe the chronology is not all-important.

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator McCLELLAN. Such a request was made.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. The third I have here is a commission in the intelligence service under Mr. Dulles, and you said you went over yourself to try to secure that for him.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is three. The fourth I have here is that if he was inducted into the service, they wanted him then re-assigned to the committee to do committee work. Was that a request for a permanent reassignment to the committee?

Secretary STEVENS. There were several requests. One was for temporary duty in New York—

Senator McCLELLAN. I know about the temporary duty, but I understood from the testimony—if I am wrong I want to be corrected—that there was a request when he got into the service to be reassigned to the committee, to serve the committee as he had before.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is that true?

Secretary STEVENS. No, but there was a request when he got into the service to have him assigned directly to New York without basic training.

Senator McCLELLAN. I know that. But there was no request for him to be reassigned back to the committee to serve the committee?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. I was mistaken about that. Then there was a request that he be assigned to the New York area.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. What service was he to perform there under that request?

Secretary STEVENS. One suggestion was to check West Point textbooks.

Senator McCLELLAN. That was a letter request, was it not? What was he to do when he was first to be assigned there and when the chairman changed his mind about it and said that he considered that it might not be well to do that—what was he to do on that first request?

Secretary STEVENS. That was to do committee work.

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. State your point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. There is no testimony, Senator McClellan—I am sure you are mistaken on this—that the former chairman ever asked Mr. Schine to be assigned to the committee or that he ever changed his mind. The only testimony on that is that when I heard he was assigned to the committee I requested he not be assigned to the committee.

Senator McCLELLAN. This may have been in the preinduction period that he was to be assigned there. You testified—someone has testified, and I think you—that later the information came to you, I think through Mr. Cohn, that the chairman had changed his mind about that and thought it might not be advisable because the press would get hold of it and make something out of it. Didn't you so testify?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir. I learned about that from Mr. Adams.

Senator McCLELLAN. Anyway, you learned of that. You have so testified. I know it is in the record somewhere.

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right, that is another request.

The fifth I have here I believe was to be assigned to New York or assigned to West Point to check the textbooks at West Point with respect to any Communist propaganda in them; is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCARTHY. Senator McClellan, I don't want to impose on your 10 minutes, but I just wonder as a personal favor if you would request of the Secretary, and make it very clear, that at no time did I ever request that Mr. Schine be assigned to my committee, that the only conversation I ever had with the Secretary was when I called and told him it would be a great mistake to draft a man and assign him back on the committee.

Senator MUNDT. Points of order will not be counted against the 10 minutes.

Senator McCLELLAN. I am asking the Secretary to testify. I am asking him the questions. I assume he will undertake to state the facts. That is all I want. I am trying to get the number of different requests for what may be or may not be preferred treatment for Mr. Schine. I have mentioned five of them.

The sixth one, I believe, was that you have testified that he wanted special privileges after he was in the service in that he was to be given liberty or was to be given leave contrary to the general leave granted to other enlisted men.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. You granted that.

Secretary STEVENS. For committee work, yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. I think you testified, unless I am wrong about this, that Mr. Schine himself suggested to you that he would make a good Undersecretary or Assistant Secretary of the Army, did he, when he drove you over to camp that morning?

Secretary STEVENS. Words to that effect, yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. So it adds up to about seven specific requests. Did anybody follow up Mr. Schine's request to you about how well he could serve you in your office? I don't want that charged against anyone else if no one else followed that up. Was any such request ever made of you or any suggestion made to you by either Mr. Cohn or Mr. Carr or Senator McCarthy with respect to that, that you take him in your office?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir; Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCLELLAN. Senator McCarthy did?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCLELLAN. So we have established here at least definitely seven special requests for assignments for privileges for Mr. Schine.

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I wonder if the Secretary would make the record clear as to whether I asked for an assistant secretaryship or under secretaryship for Mr. Schine.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is what I asked him.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like to know which. State which it was.

Secretary STEVENS. He said that he thought it would be a good idea to make use of what he called Dave Schine's special qualifications, and in that connection he suggested either as a special assistant to me on matters of communism or as a special assistant to the Chief of the Intelligence Division of the Staff, our G-2.

Senator McCLELLAN. Then for special assistant instead of just assistant?

Secretary STEVENS. Special assistant.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is that the only difference?

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I didn't get the idea that he suggested that he should be made Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Senator McCLELLAN. Well, I wanted to clarify it. He was to be made a special assistant to you but not Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Now let us clear it as to Mr. Schine, also. Did Mr. Schine request that he be made a special assistant to you, or as an Assistant Secretary of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. Not an Assistant Secretary of the Army, a special assistant to me.

Senator McCLELLAN. A special assistant?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. So that no request was made of you to make him an Assistant Secretary of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. No request.

Senator McCLELLAN. All of the requests were as special assistants to you, to perform a specific service.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. That was in connection with his alleged qualifications as Communist investigator, is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did you look into his qualifications to determine whether he was suitable to perform that service in your office?

Secretary STEVENS. No, I felt that no young man of draft age should be brought into my office as a special assistant on anything.

Senator McCLELLAN. So you did not undertake to inquire into his qualifications?

Secretary STEVENS. Not for that purpose, no, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Not for that purpose. Now, let me ask you, reverting back to my former questioning at the other 10-minute period that I had, you did have and you do have the authority if you want to do it, to overrule the subordinates to whom the applications are referred if they reject an application for a direct commission; as Secretary you have the authority if you want to exercise it, to overrule their decision and to order a direct commission granted, do you not?

Secretary STEVENS. I am sure I must have that power, Senator.

Senator McCLELLAN. You do have that power?

Secretary STEVENS. That is the way I understand it, yes, sir, that I could do it, but it is academic with me because I never would do it.

Senator McCLELLAN. You never would do it?

Secretary STEVENS. No.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right, if you had done it in this case, do you think that that would have satisfied the request?

Secretary STEVENS. Well—

Senator McCLELLAN. What I am pointing out, the implication is here, you just as well face it, sir, the implication is here that you were trying to buy off this committee from investigating the Army.

Now, if that is true, you did have the authority to grant the commission, and order it granted, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. You refused to go that far?

Secretary STEVENS. I certainly did.

Senator McCLELLAN. Now, if you were undertaking to influence them, and that was your purpose, and all of these associations with them and permitting all of these, what you are terming, impositions on your about special requests, then you did have the power to grant what they were seeking, didn't you?

Secretary STEVENS. I did.

Senator McCLELLAN. Is that correct?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct, Senator McClellan.

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's time has expired, and I will listen to the point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. I think that question is completely improper and unfair and the implication is that this chairman could have been bought off. All of the evidence is that this chairman could under no circumstances have been bought off on this investigation.

Senator McCLELLAN. You can take whatever you want from it, but the implication is here, and he has been questioned about it, as to his efforts to try to stop an investigation; and I am asking him the question if that was the purpose according to implications of questions that have been asked him he did refuse to do what he could have done that might have satisfied the situation.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I just want to point out that the implication there is that the chairman could have been bought off, and there is no evidence that this chairman ever could have been bought off any hearing, and never will be bought off any hearing.

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair remind the audience that they are here as the guests of the committee and there will be no manifestations of approval or disapproval. That is the first violation that we have had from the audience, and I am not going to ask at this time that the officers remove from the room those participating, but I am going to ask that hereafter without further instructions from the Chair those violating our standing orders, the officers will kindly correspondingly remove them from the room.

Senator Dirksen.

Mr. WELCH. I believe it is a point of order. It is that it is 4:40 p. m., and I am a strong believer in union hours when I am working in a courtroom.

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair say that at the request of his colleagues on the committee who have not gone around the table the second time, he has suggested that each member of the committee be given his additional 10 minutes; unless I am overruled by the committee, of course, your point of order will be sustained. But I would like if we could give those at the edges of our committee the same opportunity those in the center have had.

Mr. WELCH. I bow to that.

Senator MUNDT. We will try to go around the table including your 10 minutes and then Senator McCarthy and then recess.

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Secretary, I assume that if passes were granted to private Schine, that they were in writing from day to day, very likely, and signed by his immediate commanding officer.

Secretary STEVENS. I think they were.

Senator DIRKSEN. Was there any formal memorandum to the commandant at Fort Dix suggesting that he be given passes day after day to carry on committee assignments?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. There is nothing in writing then to cover that matter?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. Was there anything in writing with respect to assignment to kitchen-police duty?

Secretary STEVENS. As I say, Senator Dirksen, I really don't know. I just haven't been able to follow all of the details of Private Schine and other privates, and General Ryan I am sure will be able to answer those questions. But I just can't do so because I don't have the information.

Senator DIRKSEN. But insofar as you and General Ryan are concerned, there is no written memoranda covering weekend passes, non-assignment to KP duty, and that sort of thing?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. That was all verbal, if there was an understanding?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. Now, Mr. Secretary, I want to return to one matter that came up last week. There are 96 Senators. Can you, in a general way, state how many times you have received telephone or other requests from other Members of the Senate on either side of the aisle, with respect to direct Reserve commissions in any branch of the Army?

Secretary STEVENS. I cannot recall a single instance personally.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let us put it on this ground, and say, were the request many, or were they few?

Secretary STEVENS. So far as my knowledge of it is concerned, almost total absence of them. In other words, I don't recall a single call by a Senator to ask me for a direct commission.

Senator DIRKSEN. Now, would those requests more properly go to the Adjutant General, General Bergen?

Secretary STEVENS. They would go first into our Office of Legislative Liaison.

Senator DIRKSEN. General Reber?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, and then they would be processed around and based on the qualifications, and in due course the information would come back to General Reber, or Colonel Houck, currently Colonel Houck's office, and he would get back in touch with the Senator.

Senator DIRKSEN. The question has only two purposes, and that is this: By contrast to decide what the situation was with respect to other requests for commissions?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Senator DIRKSEN. And secondly, the general practice that is involved. There has been some comment in the press and in the columns to the effect that this may have run into the thousands, and I am trying to reconstruct my own recollection over a longer period of

time which covers nearly 20 years in the House and in the Senate, to decide how many times I may have called the Army or the Navy in the interest of a commission. And if I ever did, I want it known to all of the world that you are free if there is any telephone call to cover it, to lay it right out on the table. And I shall freely confess my sins in public, if that is the case, because I don't want to do that which is improper or ever get to the point where we have a political Army.

Now, I have an idea that I have called the Army on some cases. Offhand, I wouldn't remember what they are. Offhand, I would say that I don't think that I have pressured too much, although I shouldn't make that confession in public, because some of my constituents who might be interested in commissions might feel that I am not doing my duty if I don't pressure you. But, having been a private in the Army long ago, and having been a humble shavetail long ago, I can readily understand the attitude of people. But I am just wondering now about the general practice of Members of both the House and the Senate calling either the heads of the various military establishments, the heads of the various bureaus, or the Secretaries themselves, what the practice is, and to what extent they do bear down and what the comparison would be between those and the instant case that is before us, insofar as the allegation and the testimony are concerned.

Secretary STEVENS. I can't recall another instance of where Senators have called in connection with a commission. Certainly there is nothing with any pressure attached to it.

Senator DIRKSEN. So your answer would be that the number of calls that you have received, by and large, are rather few in number?

Secretary STEVENS. Very few.

Senator DIRKSEN. And devoid of pressure, generally.

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. In other words, they are more nearly the nature of an inquiry?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator DIRKSEN. In the hope, perhaps, that the situation is such that there might be favorable consideration given?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator Dirksen, I am speaking as the Secretary, you see, and I am not speaking to the communications that may go into the Office of Legislative Liaison. I am talking about the standpoint of the Secretary, what pressure is the Secretary under from the standpoint of and in the matter of direct commissions in the Army. And I would say in my experience that practically none.

Senator DIRKSEN. I talked to General Reber about it on occasions, I am sure, and we always like to maintain pleasant relationships with your liaison officers. But I am wondering, out of your conversations with your bureau heads, with the other Secretaries, Secretary for Air and Secretary for the Navy, whether out of the general information that has come to your attention there have been many requests, much pressure, or whether the statements that one has seen in the press from time to time are not on good ground.

Secretary STEVENS. Well, I, of course, can only speak for the Department of the Army, of my firsthand knowledge, and I have had practically no pressure, as I have said, and I think if there had been any substantial pressure in the Air Force or the Navy I would have known about it, because Secretary Talbert and Secretary Anderson

are both good friends of mine. We meet regularly, and a thing like that would undoubtedly have come up, Senator Dirksen.

Senator DIRKSEN. To be more specific, Mr. Secretary, I have great regard for Dave Lawrence, of the U. S. News & World Report. He is a very objective and factual reporter. It runs in my mind that he did do a column recently in which he indicated that this whole story ought to be made public about all the requests that have been referred to the Army, Navy, and Air Force by Members of the House and Senate in behalf of commissions, compassionate discharges, and that sort of thing.

I would just like to know the truth of it, now, whether we are such sinful people that we have been trying to convert this into a political Army, because if we have, I want to do penance and get on sack cloth and ashes right now. So you make a general statement on that, Mr. Secretary, if you will.

Secretary STEVENS. I see no evidence of making it a political Army at all, Senator Dirksen. There is a large volume of matters that are handled by the Office of Legislative Liaison which handles incidentally, correspondence from all kinds of sources in large volume, mostly inquiries for information. If it got to be a case of tremendous pressure, I would think in due course I probably would know about it.

Senator DIRKSEN. Whether this question is particularly germane to the instant inquiry, I leave for counsel to decide and object if he sees fit, but has the custom grown up when a Senator or a Congressman calls with reference to a matter of this kind, that a little note is inserted in the file with just two letters on it, "P. I."; and that doesn't mean Philippine Islands, that means "political influence." Are those inserted in the files when requests are made for commissions?

Secretary STEVENS. I have never seen one.

Senator DIRKSEN. That answers the question, I think.

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair say that he has consulted with the members of the committee, and out of deference to our union friend from Boston, we are going to resume in the morning with questions from Senator Jackson, and will adjourn at this time.

May the Chair have the attention of the Secretary long enough to be sure that we understand, as I think I am correct, that during the interim you are going to search your mind concerning Mr. Carr, and in the morning either particularize the charge or withdraw it against Mr. Carr.

Secretary STEVENS. I am certainly going to search my mind and try to do that.

Senator MUNDT. We stand in recess until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 4:55 p. m., the hearing was adjourned until 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, April 27, 1954.)

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1738

